

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., December 17, 1953

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1954, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, December 17, 1953. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,  
Mr. Hudnut,  
Prof. Belluschi,  
Mr. Peets,  
Mr. Biddle,  
Mr. de Weldon,

also, H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and  
Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on November 17, 1953, were approved.

2. RELIEF MODEL FOR MARINE MEMORIAL: Mr. de Weldon prepared and presented to the Commission for inspection a large model (about 4 feet square) showing in relief the Nevius Tract and in particular the location chosen for the Marine Memorial, near the Lee Boulevard. The Nevius Tract comprises 25 acres, of which fully 5 acres are to be allotted to the Marine Memorial and a landscape plan which will show space for a parade ground.

The Commission considered the model to be of interest, and approved the location designated for the Marine Memorial.

The Secretary stated that Mr. H. T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent, National Capital Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, will present a drawing showing the site for the Marine Memorial (as indicated in the model) and other features. It is to be a great Memorial Park, under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.



Mr. Thompson presented the drawing above mentioned. He said, "General Edson, President of the Marine Memorial Association, came to our Secretary of the Interior, and asked if the Association could have a reasonably good site on the Nevius Tract for the Marine Memorial. I was thereupon instructed to find out what in our view might be done in the way of providing for all of the things that various people are thinking about without overcrowding the area and yet give them all adequate attention and setting. The sketch which I am presenting is an elemental sketch. We have indicated a location for the Marine Memorial, near the Lee Boulevard; and at the south side of the tract a possible site for the Dutch Carillon. Back of the terrace fronting the center, a location is indicated for "A Memorial." By H. R. 6455, it is proposed to provide for a monument to the "Five Freedoms,--speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition, on this, the Nevius Tract.

The Commission sent a letter to General Edson (Exhibit A) and one to Mr. Thompson (Exhibit B), approving generally the location of the Marine Memorial on the Nevius Tract as indicated in the design; and approving the site as indicated in the model presented by Mr. de Weldon.

As for possible sites for other memorials on the Nevius Tract, the Commission of Fine Arts felt that this should be made the subject of further study, and that it is one that would be given further consideration by the Commission at some time in the future.

3. FORT DRIVE: The Secretary presented folders, illustrating this project, and stating "These come with the compliments of General Grant. Each member of the Commission has received a copy. The proponents now call it the "Fort Memorial Freeway," whereas when the Commission of Fine Arts was established, the Commission took over this project. As you know, the McMillan Commission (so-called) was created by Congress in 1901, to plan for the future



of the City of Washington and after they did that and made numerous drawings, the members of that Commission went home. When the Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910, the Commission took over this project from the McMillan Commission. The folder gives the date as 1926, but it was much earlier than that. As a matter of fact the Commission of Fine Arts found the drawings of the McMillan Commission in the basement of the Library of Congress and some in the Capitol Building; they were all but lost.

"In my book on the City of Washington, I have described the project and have given the names of the forts that are to be commemorated. Downstairs, on the first floor of this building, at the entrance to the Museum, there is a panorama of the City of Washington, which is of real interest; it shows the city surrounded by a series of hills."

Chairman Finley asked, "What is the legislative situation? Is there a bill pending to acquire the necessary lands to link up this freeway?"

The Secretary replied, "The Government owns 98 per cent of all the land necessary, and all that is needed is money for highway construction. It is proposed to dedicate in 1961, the centennial of the Civil War. Personally, I told General Grant, that "Fort Drive" is the best title because the Fort Drive or Fort Parkway is to give people an opportunity to drive around the city like a circumferential drive, where you can see the Capital City from the surrounding hills; if you call it a freeway, people will be driving 50 miles an hour, and at that rate it would be safer for them to watch the steering wheel than the city."

Chairman Finley agreed, saying, "Yes, I think Freeway would be an unfortunate name."

A letter was sent to General Grant (Exhibit C).

4. PUBLIC RELATIONS, COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Professor Belluschi asked for an opportunity to speak a moment or two on the subject of "Public Relations"





that concern the Commission of Fine Arts. He said that,

Recently Mr. Christopher Tunner, who is a professor of landscape architecture at Yale, and who is an authority on the subject, came to M. I. T. to talk to our students. He said the title of his lecture was "What kills Civic Art." Subsequently he mentioned the Howell Bill and some of the other bills pending in Congress on the subject of art. But the feeling is on the part of some people that the Howell Bill is not good for the country, and the Fine Arts Commission is put in that category. Now that puts us in an awfully bad light with millions of people that know art should be encouraged. But they do not know what the objections of the Commission are to the bill. The situation calls for an explanation.

The Commission discussed the subject at length. It was again asserted that a large Commission, such as the Howell Bill proposes, is too large and unwieldy. The Commission did recognize the need of an Opera House for the National Capital.

It was finally agreed that Dr. Hudnut should write an article (a) on the general merit of the Howell Bill; and (b) an Opera House for the National Capital.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit X).

5. PRE-CLINICAL MEDICAL BUILDING, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: Mr. L. L. Hunter, Assistant Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Administration, General Services, accompanied by Mr. Louis Justement, architect, submitted a complete set of drawings and perspective of the Pre-Clinical Medical Building, for Howard University.

The project had been given detailed study since first submission of the design in September, 1953, to the Commission, with a view to carrying out recommendations made by the Commission at that time. It is a large project, involving also a limitation of funds. The project had also been studied in cooperation with University authorities.

Mr. Justement said:





"I think it might be well to start reviewing a bit what we did the last time (at the September meeting). You may recall that I then explained the reasons for the plan and that there was this mass that went up about four stories and this mass (indicating) was a one-story projection towards the north. Here is a photostat of the first perspective that we made showing the present medical school over here. This is the four-story mass that I first spoke of as being a high mass there and then the one-story mass in front of that. That was given general approval, and I think it was Mr. Belluschi's comment then that he felt this was too wide. If possible, the instructions were to try to reduce the width of that projecting mass there, and that we have been able to do, I am glad to say.

"As to the revised plan which we now have, I will begin by showing the plot plan. I am showing the drawing upside down because the other one was shown that way—that is the reason for that. This is the existing building and this is the mass of the building that carries up four stories plus the setback, fifth floor, and this is the amount that projects beyond the general mass of the superstructure. We have been able to achieve that as a result of making this consist only of one large lecture room.

"In the previous scheme there was one large lecture room flanked by two lecture rooms and in this scheme we will only get the one large lecture room and here is a steeply graded, smaller lecture room going through two stories and another one right over that in the same location on the floor. I think this mass is going to be something that will be very much more along the lines that it was desired to have.

"With that brief explanation I think we can turn to the new perspective. This has been prepared in accordance with the latest plan. As you may see, this is the lecture room. These are very deep reveals set back from the face of the laboratories above and since this is still to be considered as the main entrance to the building, in the present building, the entrances that we have at these points (indicating) have not been emphasized unduly for architectural reasons."

Professor Belluschi said, "I think it is a great improvement. I suppose it is necessary to turn the lecture room sideways? I thought that the form of that was even more indicating that it was a meeting place; in other words, the form had become much clearer with the improvement."

Continuing, Mr. Justement said, "This is really a two-story lecture room. You enter at this level and it is steeply graded down. And at the lower level, there is a preparation room and we are reaching that preparation room under this building here and it works out generally in a more satisfactory manner to do it that way."

After some further general discussion, Dr. Hudnut said, "I think it is very nice. I like it very much."

Mr. Peets said, "I am delighted with the way it relates to the old building. It leaves the old building with its own character—has a friendly union with it."



Mr. Justement replied, "I am very pleased to get your approval and to have been able to carry out your suggestions. Plan-wise, I think we are not going to be able to do it, frankly. We are not sacrificing anything important, but it so turned out that it is one of those fortunate changes in the program that we had not anticipated which permitted us to make the change which you suggested. I was very glad to do it."

On motion, properly moved and seconded, the design was approved. A report was sent to the Commissioner of Public Buildings, accordingly (Exhibit D).

6. NEW POSTAGE STAMPS: Mr. Peets said he felt it important to call attention to certain problems that seem to be "in the offing" in connection with the proposed Program of Competition for new Postage Stamps. There appears to be a difference of opinion as to how Mr. Hall, the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, wants to do the job (that is in the same old traditional way, at least from the time he became Director in 1926) and the plan now recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts that the postage stamps be produced as the work of an artist.

The Commission felt that the points to which Mr. Peets has called attention are deserving of careful consideration, but felt that some of them may be settled by the Director of the Program of Competition, Dr. Fiske Kimball, and the Jury, in conjunction with the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit E).

7. KENILWORTH AND DEANE AVENUES OVERPASS: The Bridge Department of the District of Columbia Government submitted a design for the Kenilworth and Deane Avenues Overpass through their assistant chief, Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. Sawyer explained the drawings, stating:

"It is partially an elevated structure, with a couple of links consisting of bridges, and it is in line of Kenilworth Avenue, which is making connection with the Washington-Baltimore Parkway, and it

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..



is going to receive an awful lot of traffic from this Parkway. It was our thought that we should maintain the same criteria that they had when they designed the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. The criteria was in the way of structures, that all structures or structural features that can be seen from the Parkway should have a stone facing treatment. Bearing this in mind, we decided to include in our estimate the cost for such a treatment. Thus we have provided for a stone facing and an aluminum railing. We intend to elevate Kenilworth Avenue and bring it up over Deane Avenue, which will go underneath this structure and come down again and continue to the District Line. There are railroad tracks in the locality that bring coal (40 cars a day) to industrial establishments, but these are to be removed in the near future. We also intend to do some landscaping, so as to protect the Parkway from ugly industrial sections."

The Commission advised that, pending removal of the railroad tracks, something be done to protect the public by means of gates, stop-lights, etc.

After some discussion in matters of detail, Mr. Peets said, "I do not intend proposing any changes."

Thereupon, on motion, properly moved and seconded, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit F).

8. AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR BUILDING: Chairman Finley read the following letter received from Mr. Ralph Walker, architect of the new building:

December 8, 1953

"Thank you very much for your letter of November 16th, telling me of the resolution of the Commission of Fine Arts in relation to the building for the American Federation of Labor in Washington. I appreciate the trust in me and you may be sure that George Meany and others in the American Federation of Labor are also pleased with your concurrence."

9. OLD GEORGETOWN BUILDINGS: (Submission No. O. G. 747, dated November 5, 1953, for razing premises 3614-16-18-20 "O" Street, Northwest, Sq. 1226).

Chairman Finley said the property is owned by the President and Directors of Georgetown College, and that last summer our Committee of Consulting Architects reported to their Administrative Officer, Mr. MacGregor, that the complaint made as to unsightly rear-yard conditions did not justify the razing of

The first of these is the fact that the  
the second is the fact that the  
the third is the fact that the  
the fourth is the fact that the  
the fifth is the fact that the  
the sixth is the fact that the  
the seventh is the fact that the  
the eighth is the fact that the  
the ninth is the fact that the  
the tenth is the fact that the

The first of these is the fact that the  
the second is the fact that the  
the third is the fact that the  
the fourth is the fact that the  
the fifth is the fact that the  
the sixth is the fact that the  
the seventh is the fact that the  
the eighth is the fact that the  
the ninth is the fact that the  
the tenth is the fact that the



the residences themselves, which are of the 1880 Old Georgetown period (Exhibit G). The project now comes before this Commission officially, and to that end, Chairman Finley said, he received a letter yesterday from the Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S. J., President of the University, stating that the University would not be warranted in spending the amount necessary to renovate the old buildings; also the University owns 90% of the land in the square, on which it is proposed to build a new Foreign Service Building (Exhibit H).

Also, Chairman Finley said, he had a personal talk with Father Walsh of the University, who is in full sympathy with the work that this Commission is doing for Old Georgetown, and gave assurance that the new building when designed would be in keeping with the Old Georgetown tradition.

In discussing the subject, the Commission felt that, in the light of new evidence presented by President Bunn regarding the proposed new building, it would be but fair to the University to approve razing the buildings.

The matter was discussed with the Committee of Architectural Consultants, Messrs. Macomber, Foster, and Winslow, at luncheon, who were the guests of the Commission at the National Gallery of Art. Both the Committee and the Commission agreed unanimously that, in view of plans for the new Foreign Service Building of the University, as set forth in the letter from President Bunn, there should be no further objection to razing the buildings. The Building Inspector's Office of the District Government was advised accordingly.

10. RESIGNATION OF MR. FOSTER: Mr. Wm. Dewey Foster presented his resignation as a member of the Committee of Architectural Consultants in a letter addressed to the Commission (Exhibit I). The Commission felt that, in view of reasons presented and the fact that he had served on the Committee for three years at considerable sacrifice, his resignation be accepted. The Commission recommended the appointment of Mr. Walter G. Peter, Jr., a practicing architect



of Georgetown, on the Committee. (See also Exhibit I-1, Letter of appreciation to Mr. Foster).

11. FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS: Mr. de Weldon said,

"At a dinner meeting recently with Hon. Myron M. Cowan, who was Ambassador to Belgium, Australia, and the Philippines, and later Assistant Secretary of State, he told me of the difficulties he had with the Foreign Buildings Administration, especially in Belgium.

"The Foreign Buildings Administration bought a perfectly beautiful house or mansion in the traditional style of architecture in one of the medievall squares of Brussels and they wanted to tear it down. After the Belgian people objected vehemently, they agreed to leave the front facade but tear everything else down; that was done. The Belgian people, of course, thought we were barbarians—that we had no feeling for their architecture. Thereupon, the Foreign Buildings Administration designed the most awful building which inside had no relation to the facade, and was completely impractical. The kitchen for instance measured 40 x 60 feet. The dining room was so small that they could not seat more than 15 people at a formal dinner; and the outcome of it was that the head of the Foreign Buildings Administration, Mr. King, was fired. Now the Ambassador would like very much to discuss the subject in an informal way and get the advice of the Fine Arts Commission as to what could be done as to the situation generally—with regard to all U. S. foreign building. He mentioned a chancery in Canberra that was built while he was Ambassador to Australia. As one entered the building, there immediately in front were the toilet rooms, marked "Men," "Women." It was criticized greatly in Canberra. At the present time there are no architects on the Foreign Service Buildings "Commission." There are three cabinet officers; no architects."

Chairman Finley said,

"I might say that since Mr. King has resigned, there has been a reorganization of the Foreign Buildings Office in the Department of State and I think it might be profitable for us to invite them to meet with us at the next meeting, if they would like to do so, and ascertain if it would not be helpful for the Foreign Service Buildings Office to submit their designs to this Commission. We do have submission of designs to the Commission of Fine Arts from the American Battle Monuments Commission, and there is no reason why the State Department should not submit their designs to the Commission of Fine Arts. I think there should be some control over it because heretofore Mr. King and his predecessor, Mr. Larkin, have had almost a free hand to erect what they liked, and it has brought a great deal of criticism, in Madrid, for example, and various other places that I know. I would be very glad if the State Department asked to have our advice with regard to these buildings when the design is made."





Professor Belluschi said,

"I see the other side. He received criticism. I think I know a little about it. Mr. King was the first one to go far afield to try to get something representing American contemporary architecture. Unfortunately, he made some serious mistakes, one I suppose in Belgium, and incurred the wrath of Ambassador Cowan. I think LIFE MAGAZINE had an article about it. That building in Belgium was a bad one if there ever was one.

"On the other hand, he picked architects such as Kidmore and Ralph Robinson and others who are really doing something, and Wallace Harrison, who did the United Nations Building. And if you read, the feeling of the architectural profession is strongly backing Mr. King. So you hear criticism of one kind which is well-founded because it is based on mistakes of one kind or another; on the other hand, there are those who want the work of good American architects represented by contemporary up-to-date style of building. I do not think that the right is all on one side and the wrong all on the other. There are really two points of view."

Chairman Finley said,

"I am not either defending or condemning Mr. King for anything he has done. I merely say he has been discharged, and I think, personally, that right now there is nothing to do but to wait until the new organization in the State Department, the Foreign Buildings Office, works out their plans. Perhaps they intend to get an advisory body of architects, or to ask the Commission of Fine Arts to do something about the matter. I don't know. I think we could hold the matter in abeyance for a month."

Accordingly, the Commission agreed to this.

12. MURAL PAINTING, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING: The Commission met in the Conference Room of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Lindsay Warren, to inspect a painting by Mitchell Jamieson, done in oil, and depicting historical scenes in North Carolina. Mr. Warren said he was very well pleased with the painting, because it represents most interesting and historical scenes not only concerning the history of North Carolina, his home State, but also the United States. These were explained by Mr. Warren to the Commission as, a scene depicting the Lost Colony at Fort Raleigh; traces of Indian settlement; an old Court House, early colonial settlement; the Capital Building at Raleigh of the nineteenth century; and



CONFIDENTIAL - SECURITY MATTER

It is the policy of the United States to support the efforts of the people of the Republic of China to maintain their freedom and independence. The United States will continue to provide military and economic assistance to the Republic of China, and will oppose any attempt to force the Republic of China to accept a position of lesser status than that which it has earned by its own achievements.

The United States will continue to support the Republic of China in its efforts to maintain its freedom and independence. The United States will continue to provide military and economic assistance to the Republic of China, and will oppose any attempt to force the Republic of China to accept a position of lesser status than that which it has earned by its own achievements.

CONFIDENTIAL - SECURITY MATTER

It is the policy of the United States to support the efforts of the people of the Republic of China to maintain their freedom and independence. The United States will continue to provide military and economic assistance to the Republic of China, and will oppose any attempt to force the Republic of China to accept a position of lesser status than that which it has earned by its own achievements.

CONFIDENTIAL - SECURITY MATTER

It is the policy of the United States to support the efforts of the people of the Republic of China to maintain their freedom and independence. The United States will continue to provide military and economic assistance to the Republic of China, and will oppose any attempt to force the Republic of China to accept a position of lesser status than that which it has earned by its own achievements.

the first flight of the Wright Brothers, at Kitty Hawk, on December 17, 1903, just 50 years ago. The painting was done in a color and tone to conform to the woodwork of the Conference Room.

The Commission were well pleased with the painting and approved it. A report was sent to Mr. Warren (Exhibit J) and to the Commissioner of Public Buildings (Exhibit K) accordingly.

Mr. Warren said the second painting, for his own personal office, is to be finished in about a month.

The Commission expressed the hope that some additional paintings might be placed in the lobby of the building some time in the near future.

13. AMERICAN MILITARY CEMETERY AT MANILA: The Commission met in the Office of Brigadier General Thomas North, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and conferred with him and with Mr. John F. Harbeson, Consulting Architect, regarding a revised model and designs that had been made by Gardner Daily, of San Francisco, architect of the project.

The Commission felt that the new model and designs were an improvement over previous ones inspected by the Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting held in January, 1951.

Mr. Harbeson pointed out the old model, and said, "The original model, which you see there, was based on having a single center for the curve on which the field is laid out. The tower was too high. I think you recommended that we try again and suggested lowering the tower. Both of these things have been done. This (the new) model, which is double the size of the old, shows the divided center, and the lowering of this building. The old tower was to be 108 feet high, but there was objection to it, ascertained since 1951, by the Airport authorities, who have a field nearby. The tower on the new model is to be 50 feet high. Here you see the center. The width overall is just the

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm blanket I had been sitting under. I looked up at the sky, which was a pale, hazy blue. The air was still, and there was a sense of quiet solitude. I took a deep breath, feeling the cool air fill my lungs. The ground beneath my feet was soft and uneven, covered in a layer of dry leaves and grass. I walked slowly, my steps creating a gentle rustling sound. In the distance, I could see the faint outlines of trees and buildings, but they were too far away to make out clearly. The overall atmosphere was one of peace and tranquility, a moment of stillness in a world that was always in motion. I felt a sense of freedom, as if I had been released from a long confinement. The sun was just beginning to rise, casting a soft, golden glow over the landscape. The colors were muted and earthy, a palette of browns, greys, and soft blues. I continued to walk, my mind wandering to the thoughts that had been swirling in my head. The silence was not empty; it was full of possibilities and potential. I felt a connection to the world around me, a sense of belonging. The journey ahead was uncertain, but for now, this moment was perfect. I was exactly where I needed to be.

same, 325 feet. The distance across the back of the platform is the same in both models. Instead of concrete, against the use of which the Commission objected, and which we find would not be suitable because it gets a fungus which turns it black and is very unprepossessing, it is proposed to use "romblon marble," a local stone quarried near Manila."

The stelae will commemorate the names of 30,000 UNKNOWN DEAD from the Pacific area, and its islands, China, Burma, India, Japan. There are also 17,000 graves of American soldiers in the Cemetery, which covers an area of 150 acres. Reference was made to the Piazza San Pietro, and it was pointed out that this colonnade at Manila should not have so large a gap or opening, a limit of 90 feet.

General North said, as far as paintings are concerned, there will probably be some mosaic maps.

Sculptural embellishments and inscriptions have not as yet been agreed upon.

Instead of a formal report from the Commission of Fine Arts, it was decided to adopt the suggestion of Mr. Peets, namely, that the criticisms and suggestions of the Commission (to be conveyed to Gardner Dailey by Mr. Harbeson) are not set forth as requirements, but that these points are raised for his own determination.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and is made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit I).

14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Thursday, January 28, 1954.

The Commission adjourned at 4:10 p.m.





C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 18, 1953

Dear General Edson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 17, 1953, considered a landscape plan of the Nevius Tract, which was submitted by Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

The Commission approved the location of the United States Marine Corps War Memorial as indicated in the design. Likewise, the Commission inspected a model, submitted by the Sculptor, Mr. Felix W. de Weldon, showing the location of this Memorial on the Nevius Tract, which the Commission approved.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson,  
USMC (Ret.), President,  
Marine Corps War Memorial  
Foundation, Incorporated,  
Henderson Hall,  
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

# THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON FROM 1630 TO 1880

By J. B. COVINGTON

NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1880.

The history of the city of Boston, from 1630 to 1880, is a story of growth and development. It begins with the first settlement in 1630, when a group of Puritans, led by John Winthrop, arrived in the city. They found a small village of Native Americans, and they began to build a new city. The city grew rapidly, and by 1680 it was one of the largest and most important cities in the New England colonies. In 1773, the city was the center of the American Revolution, and it was here that the Boston Tea Party took place. After the war, the city continued to grow, and by 1880 it was one of the largest and most important cities in the United States. The city's history is a story of the struggle for freedom and the development of a great city.

THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

FROM 1630 TO 1880

By J. B. COVINGTON  
NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1880.  
THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON  
FROM 1630 TO 1880  
By J. B. COVINGTON  
NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1880.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 18, 1953

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 17, 1953, were pleased to consider the landscape plan of the Nevius Tract, which you submitted to the Commission for consideration.

The Commission approved the location of the United States Marine Corps War Memorial as indicated on the design.

As for possible sites for other memorials on the Nevius Tract, the Commission of Fine Arts felt that this should be made the subject for further study, and that it is one that would be given further consideration by the Commission sometime in the future.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson,  
Associate Superintendent,  
National Capital Parks,  
National Park Service,  
Department of the Interior,  
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT B



C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 18, 1953

Dear General Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts wish to thank you for the folders on "The Fort Memorial Freeway" received from you.

They were considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held on December 17, 1953. The Commission recalled that this has been a pending project before this Commission over a period of many years; in fact, from the time of the establishment of the Commission in 1910, as one of the projects recommended by the McMillan Commission for a driveway to encircle the National Capital.

We hope that this project may be completed by 1961 as suggested.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant, 3rd, Ret'd.  
President,  
Columbia Historical Society,  
1135 - 21st Street, N. W.,  
Washington 6, D. C.

EXHIBIT C





C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 17, 1953

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 17, 1953, approved the design for the Pre-Clinical Medical Building, submitted by the Office of the Supervising Architect in your behalf.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Honorable W. E. Reynolds,  
Commissioner of Public  
Buildings Service,  
General Services Administration,  
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT D



## New Postage Stamps

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right, then, why don't you go ahead, Elbert?

Mr. PEETS: This is formalizing the situation perhaps a little more than was justified, but I will start with the first things I have on my mind.

I feel that the first principle is that we should endeavor to maintain a modest and inconspicuous relation to this operation of the competition. I know that that is just the opposite of Mr. Biddle's point of view, but I have the feeling that we cannot be too sure that we are working with enthusiastic supporters on the part of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The situation with respect particularly to Mr. Hall of the Bureau is that he has been attacked by us in our report. He feels that he and his men are the ones who are criticized in our report and he is particularly anxious to protect his people and his functions as all such officials are anxious to do.

One point that illustrates this is that he was very emphatic in saying at the time when Mr. Finley read Dean Hudnut's outline for a competition program and came to the point where it says that the denominations, you said eight cents, would be plainly lettered in two places, or something of that sort, Mr. Hall immediately said that that was unnecessary because his men would take care of all of that kind of material. That is, they would supply the frame and the inscriptions and the numbers; that what he wanted was the picture.

Now, that is a very vital aspect because you are not designing a stamp if you are only supplying a picture and they are putting on the lettering and other formal elements to their own taste.

Whether we should go as far as to say that the design must be a design of a stamp and not the picture, I would not want to say but I bring up that point as being an extremely important one because it could very easily happen that a beautiful picture would be chosen, but it would be anything but a beautiful stamp after they got through with it. That derives in part from their influence upon the design, the mechanical situation, I am afraid that there is much possibility that the artists' pictures, as I call them, will not be realized in the printed, finished stamp because of the procedure that they have to go through in their system of preparing a die by means of steel engraving and etching. In all of these cases etching is used even more than printing and engraving. In that process they have prepared the original drawing. Then they transfer the drawing to the steel. I mean they transfer the drawing which they call the model, to the steel in terms of an engraving, partly etched and partly engraved with an engraver, or burin, as they call it, as the artists usually call it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right, then, who don't you no more, Albert?

Mr. FEET: This is formalizing the situation perhaps a little more than was justified, but I will start with the first thing I have on my mind.

I feel that the first principle is that we should endeavor to maintain a modest and inconspicuous relation to this operation of the competition. I know that that is just the opposite of Mr. E. B. Hall's point of view, but I have the feeling that we cannot be too sure that we are working with enthusiastic supporters on the part of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The situation with respect particularly to Mr. Hall of the Bureau is that he has been attacked by us in our report. He feels that he and his men are the ones who are criticized in our report and he is particularly anxious to protect his people and his functions as all such officials are anxious to do.

One point that illustrates this is that he was very emphatic in saying at the time when Mr. Finley read Dean Hurd's outline for a competition program and came to the point where it says that the denominations, for said eight cents, would be plainly lettered in two places, or something of that sort. Mr. Hall immediately said that that was unnecessary because his men would take care of all of that kind of material. That is, they would supply the frame and the inscriptions and the numbers that what he wanted was the picture.

Now, that is a very vital aspect because you are not designing a stamp if you are only supplying a picture and they are putting on the lettering and other formal elements to their own taste.

Whether we should go as far as to say that the design must be a design of a stamp and not the picture, I would not want to say but I bring up that point as being an extremely important one because it could very easily happen that a beautiful picture would be chosen, but it would be anything but a beautiful stamp after they got through with it. That derives in part from their influence upon the design, the mechanical situation, I am afraid, that there is much possibility that the artists' pictures, as I am saying, will not be realized in the printed, finished stamp because of the procedure that they have to go through in their system of preparing a design, means of steel engraving and etching. In all of these cases etching is used even more than printing and engraving. In that process they have prepared the original drawing. Then they transfer the drawing to the steel. I mean they transfer the drawing which they call the model, to the steel in terms of an engraving, partly etched and partly engraved with an engraver, or burn, as they call it, as the artists usually call it.



This process involves first the die, then the roller which is a negative of the die and then the plates from which the stamps are printed which are substantially duplicates of the die, but having through the process of being impressed on a roller and then re-impressed on the plates. Of course, you all understand how that is done so it is unnecessary for me to explain. But that process and the process of printing 110,000,000 in a couple of weeks, using rotary press, there are many factors there which deprive the final result from having the traditional characteristics of a steel engraving. It isn't that the first quality steel engraving by the time it gets on the corner of the envelope. There could easily be great disappointments in that respect in the operation of the making stamps out of the artists premiated picture. One of the factors is that the stamps invariably as printed have a tint over them, a tint of the same color. When the stamp is green, like the Theodore Roosevelt Home, the design is printed in gree; but there is a strong green tinge over the entire stamp which is utterly foreign to the character of a steel engraving which always in the classical period of about a century ago when beautiful steel engravings were made was an absolute black line, whether thick or thin, a black line on an absolutely white surface and the brilliance and finish and fascinating charm of a good steel engraving derived from that precision and the very sharp contrast; whereas, in a stamp, as it comes to us from the Post Office, much of that precision has been lost and there is not the brilliance; the stamps are dull.

I do not know at what point to exhibit this toy that I prepared last night. The American stamps there will be recognized as relatively dull. They do not stand out with contrast of light and dark as the best of the foreign stamps do. That is a difficult think to allow for and is, I think, an ultimate part of our campaign. I do not feel that we should leave the situation one in which we are merely suggesting a difference way, a new way, to get the picture on which the stamp is based. We should have in mind all of the factors there, the design, the printing, and take that total view of it in order to get the improvement.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Elbert, what it really comes down to is that you think the process used at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is such that we would not get clear-cut results with the contrasting color that we would like; is that it?

MR. PEETS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I do not suppose it is within the range of possibilities at the moment to change that method?

MR. PEETS: No; but still, those matters must be evaluated and recognized.

Mr. BELLUSCHI: Right in the program we thought it was very important to see that the process would be confined just like the architectural problems; certain limitations, and those are it. If the artist is a good artist,



This process involves first the die, then the roller which is negative of the die and then the plates from which the stamps are printed which are substantially duplicates of the die. In carrying through the process of being impressed on a roller and then re-impressed on the plates. Of course, you do understand how that is done so it is unnecessary for me to explain. But that process and the process of printing 110,000 in a couple of weeks, using rotary press, there are many factors there which deprive the final result from having the traditional characteristics of a steel engraving. It isn't that the final quality is engraving by the time it gets on the corner of the envelope. There are easily the greatest disappointments in that respect in the operation of the making stamps out of the artists' premiated pictures. One of the factors is that the stamps invariably as printed have a tint over them, a tint of the same color. When the stamp is green, like the Theodore Roosevelt Home, the design is printed in green, but there is a strong green tinge over the entire stamp which is utterly foreign to the character of a steel engraving which always in the classical period of about a century ago when beautiful steel engravings were made was an absolute black line, whether thick or thin, a black line on an absolutely white surface and the brilliance and finish and fascinating charm of a good steel engraving derived from that precision and the very sharp contrast, whereas, in a stamp, as it comes to us from the Post Office, much of that precision has been lost and there is not the brilliance the stamps are dull.

I do not know at what point to exhibit this for that I proposed last night. The American stamps there will be recognized as relatively dull. They do not stand out with contrast of light and dark as the best of the foreign stamps do. That is a difficult thing to allow for and I think an ultimate part of our campaign. I do not feel that we should leave the situation one in which we are merely suggesting a difference way, a way to get the picture on which the stamp is based. We should have in mind all of the factors there, the design, the printing, and take that into view of it in order to get the improvement.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Right, what it really comes down to is that you think the process used at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is such that we would not get clear-cut results with the contrasting color that we would like; is that it?

MR. FEET: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I do not suppose it is within the range of possibilities at the moment to change that method?

MR. FEET: No; but still, those matters must be evaluated and recognized.

MR. BULLUSCH: Right in the program we thought it was very important to see that the process would be defined just like the architectural problems; certain limitations, and those are it. In the artist is a good artist.

you have to take that into consideration. But those things have to be explained to them and I think that should be part of the program. All the things you said this morning should be written in very clearly, underlined.

MR. PEETS: When the Post Office Department secures from the Bureau die proofs, as they call them of the stamps that die proof is a print directly from this one little engraving at the size of the stamp on a little piece of steel three and a half inches square and that is very carefully inked and cleaned off so that it makes a beautiful, brilliant, print. They print that in a little roller press so that at the Post Office Department they can show you these beautiful die proofs of their stamps. But if you take that as being the end product of your competition, a great mistake will be made because it is not that beautiful die proof but it is the final stamp on the envelope that will say whether the public are astonished and pleased by the result or whether they just say, here is another Bureau of Engraving stamp. I am not suggesting exactly what should be done about that. It would have to be handled in a program, of course; but it is important that all those factors be kept in mind so that we must not feel our desirable results are going to come automatically. We cannot assume that the venture will necessarily be a success.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In the beginning, I think we have to work within the limitations that are set by the operation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. As I understood Mr. Hall, he made the point that he did have a position equivalent to the sculptor and engraver in the Post Office Department. That was the point we made in our report. I thought that was the reason for his irritation, the fact that we had said in our report that he did not have such a position, whereas he claims that he did have.

Then he went on to say that when, as a result of this competition, we secured a design and furnished it to them, the artist could place the numerals where they should go in the design, and the type of numeral, style of numeral that he wanted, but that the Bureau of Engraving would adapt those numerals to the different denominations of the stamps. Is that not correct?

MR. PEETS: No. It is just the last statement I think that is not correct. At least, not the way I took it. He immediately said that it was unnecessary to put the number on the artist's picture because he said, we will determine that; and at other times he has said that they would make a stamp up -- not in these words, but he said in substance that they would make the stamp out of the picture. I am sure that if the matter was brought to him explicitly as it will be if the program is submitted to him (he will be) definitely in favor of their doing the frame and the lettering because that will keep their men busy. Then they will have some work connected with it. It is not merely an engraving but also in that designing. He is anxious that his men should not be supplanted; that the system should not be changed so much that it would make a vital difference to him in his little organization of which he has been the head since 1926.

you have to take that into consideration. But those things have to be explained to them and I think that should be part of the program. All the things you said this morning should be written in very clearly, understandable.

MR. FEETS: When the Post Office Department secures from the Bureau die proofs, as they call them of the stamps that the proof is a print directly from this one little engraving at the size of the stamp on a little piece of steel three and a half inches square and that is very carefully inked and cleaned off so that it makes a beautiful, brilliant print. They print that in a little roller press so that at the Post Office Department they can show you these beautiful die proofs of their stamps. But if you take that as being the end product of your competition, a great mistake will be made because it is not that beautiful die proof but it is the final stamp on the envelope that will say whether the public are satisfied and pleased by the result or whether they just say, here is another Bureau of Engraving stamp. I am not suggesting exactly what should be done about that. It would have to be handled in a program, of course; but it is important that all those factors be kept in mind so that we must not feel our desirable results are going to come automatically. We cannot assume that the venture will necessarily be a success.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In the beginning, I think we have to work within the limitations that are set by the operation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. As I understood Mr. Hall, he made the point that he did have a position equivalent to the sculptor and engraver in the Post Office Department. That was the point we made in our report. I thought that was the reason for his irritation, the fact that we had said in our report that he did not have such a position, whereas he claims that he did have.

Then he went on to say that when, as a result of this competition, we secured a design and furnished it to them, the artist could place the numerals where they should go in the design, and the type of numeral, style of numeral that he wanted, but that the Bureau of Engraving would adapt those numerals to the different denominations of the stamps. Is that not correct?

MR. FEETS: No. It is just the last statement I think that is not correct. At least, not the way I took it. He immediately said that it was unnecessary to put the number on the artist's picture because he said, we will determine that; and at other times he has said that they would make a stamp up -- not in these words, but he said in substance that they would make the stamp out of the picture. I am sure that if the matter was brought to him explicitly as it will be if the program is submitted to him (he will be) definitely in favor of their doing the frame and the lettering because that will keep their men busy. Then they will have some work connected with it. It is not merely an engraving but also in that designing. He is anxious that his men should not be supplanted; that the system should not be changed so much that it would make a vital difference to him in his little organization of which he has been the head since 1920.



So he is in a position where a failure on the part of the competition would be advantageous to him because it would --

MR. BIDDLE: No question about that.

MR. PEETS: It would prove that even the Fine Arts Commission, given a free rein, we did exactly what the Fine Arts Commission asked us and this is what we get.

MR. BIDDLE: I think he is in a position, too, where the success of the competition would be to his advantage.

MR. PEETS: It would be if the competition is restricted to the picture and his men make a stamp out of the picture; then a success in the competition would be an advantage partly because it would be only a partial designing of the stamp leaving still some work for him to do, and then because it would be a temporary incident. It would be one stamp or six stamps out of years and years of stamps.

MR. BIDDLE: I can't help really feeling that that is not a question; that question of numerals that could not be quietly worked out between Fiske Kimball's committee and his body of engravers. After all, every architect knows that you can adapt certain types of lettering, you know, to certain designs. All the artist would have to do would be to indicate a placing and size and type of his numerals and that could be adapted by his committee to suit their purposes. I think that is a question of ---

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Suppose the winning design should be similar to these Netherlands stamps where the numeral is the feature of the design. Then the artist would furnish that design and you would have to use it.

MR. BIDDLE: You do not think that is just a question of sympathetic understanding between the artist, the Committee, and the Bureau of Engraving the way such questions are always ironed out between architects and the work they do?

MR. PEETS: I am inclined to think that the artist would easily adapt himself to the suggestion that they are making a picture and that the details could be worked out in the Bureau. But I can't imagine an architect or a professional designer saying that he was designing a stamp when he was just leaving notes for those details.

MR. BIDDLE: Why do you think the artist should have a different point of view if he is intelligent. If he is an intelligent designer, that is what he is.

MR. PEETS: Then he should show it fully; it should be a design.

MR. BIDDLE: Of course; obviously.

So he is in a position where a failure on the part of the competition would be advantageous to him because it would --

MR. BIDDLE: No question about that.

MR. FETTS: It would prove that even the Fine Arts Commission, in a free rein, we did exactly what the Fine Arts Commission asked us and this is what we got.

MR. BIDDLE: I think he is in a position, too, where the success of the competition would be to his advantage.

MR. FETTS: It would be if the competition is restricted to the picture and his men make a stamp out of the picture; then a success in the competition would be an advantage partly because it would be only a partial designing of the stamp leaving still some work for him to do, and then because it would be a temporary incident. It would be one stamp or six stamps out of years and years of stamps.

MR. BIDDLE: I can't help really feeling that that is not a question; the question of numerals that could not be quietly worked out between Fiske Kimball's committee and his body of engravers. After all, every architect knows that you can adapt certain types of lettering, you know, to certain designs. All the artist would have to do would be to indicate a placing and size and type of his numerals and that could be adapted by his committee to suit their purposes. I think that is a question of ---

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Suppose the winning design should be similar to these Netherlands stamps where the numeral is the feature of the design. Then the artist would furnish that design and you would have to use it.

MR. BIDDLE: You do not think that is just a question of sympathetic understanding between the artist, the Committee, and the Bureau of Engraving the way such questions are always ironed out between architects and the way they do?

MR. FETTS: I am inclined to think that the artist would easily adapt himself to the suggestion that they are making a picture and that the details could be worked out in the Bureau. But I can't imagine an architect or a professional designer saying that he was designing a stamp when he was just leaving notes for these details.

MR. BIDDLE: Why do you think the artist should have a different point of view if he is intelligent. If he is an intelligent designer, that is what he is.

MR. FETTS: Then he should show it fully; it should be a design.

MR. BIDDLE: Of course; obviously.



MR. BELLUSCHI: I think you are taking Mr. Hall too seriously. Obviously, he meant it when he said it but he meant it out of ignorance, not casting any aspersions on him. He probably did not, I think, realize quite what was meant by good design of a stamp. He thought it was a good picture and it could be put inside a frame, but in reality it can be made clear to him that the whole stamp is the thing.

MR. PEETS: That he would not accept any more than he would accept the idea that he did not have that high-priced artist on his staff. He immediately points to two gentlemen there. They are -- excuse me -- old horses that have been around there for forty years and when we went into their shop the samples they showed us, everything they showed us, everything we look at was full proof of the fact that they were exactly the kind that we did not want to supervise the work. They did not have elan in themselves whatsoever; no vitality; you can look at those things there. Look at that Ernani, how that stands out as being superior to everything else because it is imaginative.

MR. BIDDLE: What is your suggestion, Elbert?

MR. PEETS: It is primarily that those things have to be cleared up and understood, either with us or with that chap, that it won't do to let this thing roll along and get into the stage where they fixed a date.

MR. BIDDLE: I agree with you.

MR. PEETS: He is going to come out with a statement that they are not giving prices; they are buying designs and he won't buy a design that he does not like. All of the submissions in the competition will be judged on their general artistic merits and on their technical appropriateness to his manner of printing; and he is going to be there and say, this design could be engraved and that could not be engraved.

MR. BIDDLE: Aren't these questions that will have to be ironed out with Fiske Kimball's committee or whoever it is that will be in charge of the competition?

Mr. Belluschi: He cannot say, I won't buy this design. This is a thing selected by the jury and if he doesn't have to -- but then he will be putting an awful burden on himself if he does not.

MR. BIDDLE: Obviously, he and the jury will have to get together on the statement to the artists and it will have to satisfy both parties. It will have to satisfy the jury who commissions the artist, and it will have to satisfy the Post Office Department.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think these are technical details we could leave to the Committee.

MR. BIDDLE: Plus the Post Office Department.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think you are taking the Hall too seriously. Obviously, he meant it when he said it but he is not out of his mind. He probably did not think, however, not casting any aspersions on him. He probably did not think, however, quite what was meant by good design of a stamp. The illustration was a good picture and it could be put inside a frame, but in reality it can be made clear to him that the whole stamp is the thing.

MR. FEET: That he would not accept any more than he would accept the idea that he did not have that high-priced artist on his staff. He has immediately points to two gentlemen there. They are -- excuse me -- and horses that have been around there for forty years and when we were into their shop the samples they showed us, everything they showed us, everything we look at was full proof of the fact that they were exactly the kind of thing we did not want to supervise the work. They did not have a plan in themselves whatsoever; no vitality; you can look at those things there, look at that stamp, how that stands out as being superior to everything else because it is imaginative.

MR. BIDDLE: What is your suggestion, Elbert?

MR. FEET: It is primarily that those things have to be cleared up and understood, either with us or with that chap, that it would do to let this thing roll along and get into the stage where they fixed a date.

MR. BIDDLE: I agree with you.

MR. FEET: He is going to come out with a statement that they are not giving prizes; they are buying designs and he won't buy a design that he does not like. All of the submissions in the competition will be judged on their general artistic merits and on their technical appropriateness to his manner of printing; and he is going to be there and say, this design could be engraved and that could not be engraved.

MR. BIDDLE: Aren't these questions that will have to be ironed out with Fiske Kimball's committee or whoever it is that will be in charge of the competition?

MR. BELLUSCHI: He cannot say, I won't buy this design. This is a thing selected by the jury and if he doesn't have to -- but then he will be putting an awful burden on himself if he does not.

MR. BIDDLE: Obviously, he and the jury will have to get together on the statement to the artists and it will have to satisfy both parties. It will have to satisfy the jury who commissions the artist and it will have to satisfy the Post Office Department.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: I think there are technical details we could leave to the Committee.

MR. BIDDLE: Plus the Post Office Department.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Anyhow, we have an opportunity to have a competition for a stamp. I do not think the Fine Arts Commission should drop out of the picture, as it were, or that we should make ourselves too unimportant, because the Post Office Department is relying on us to help to make a success of this thing and they asked us that specific question: if we were going to leave them and I said, "No, Certainly not; that if the Post Master General wanted to make an announcement that the competition is being held by the Post Office Department in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts, we would be very glad for him to do so." I think that did meet with everyone's approval; is that not right?

MR. MR. BIDDLE: Yes.

Mr. Hudnut: I think Elbert made a pretty good point there. We do not want to take responsibility without control. And if the picture is as you have drawn it, that we have not control, we cannot collaborate with the Post Office Department.

MR. FEETS: That is right. There is the problem of identifying the responsibility. He would like to have us take the responsibility so as to have somebody to hide behind in case the thing did not come out in a popular manner.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It was never clear to me that we would give up responsibility. I think we will have responsibility both in pointing out the jury and to the committee in charge of the selection, so they will be properly apprized and will know what the problem is, and that it will be accepted. In other words, we cannot retreat. We cannot say we are going to give up.

MR. HUDNUT: What is the status of this committee? I am uninformed about that. What is this committee you refer to?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Pietro, you explain it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Simply that you suggested that there be a jury and I think Mr. Fiske Kimball was approached as being the chairman of the committee.

MR. HUDNUT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I lunched with Fiske and Mrs. Kimball in Wilmington Sunday a week ago. I was talking with him and I said, confidentially, there is a plan on foot for a stamp competition and many people would like you to be chairman of the committee. He said that if he is invited, he will accept.

MR. HUDNUT: Is it a committee that we appoint?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Anyhow, we have an opportunity to make a contribution for a stamp. I do not think the Fine Arts Commission should be out of the picture, as it were, or that we should make ourselves too important, because the Post Office Department is relying on us to help to make a success of this thing and they asked us that specific question: if we were going to leave them and I said, "No, Certainly not; that if the Postmaster General wanted to make an announcement that the competition is being held by the Post Office Department in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts, we would be very glad for him to do so." I think that did meet with everyone's approval; is that not right?

MR. MR. BIDDLE: Yes.

MR. HUDNUT: I think Elbert made a pretty good point there. We do not want to take responsibility without control. And if the picture is as you have drawn it, that we have not control, we cannot collaborate with the Post Office Department.

MR. FEIST: That is right. There is the problem of identifying the responsibility. He would like to have us take the responsibility, so as to have somebody to hide behind in case the thing did not come out in a popular manner.

MR. BELMUSCH: It was never clear to me that we would give up responsibility. I think we will have responsibility both in pointing out the jury and to the committee in charge of the selection, so they will be properly apprised and will know what the problem is, and that it will be accepted. In other words, we cannot retreat. We cannot say we are going to give up.

MR. HUDNUT: What is the status of this committee? I am uninformed about that. What is this committee you refer to?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I fear, you explain it.

MR. BELMUSCH: Simply that you suggested that there be a jury and I think Mr. Elise Kimball was approached as being the chairman of the committee.

MR. HUDNUT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I lunched with Elise and Mrs. Kimball in Washington Sunday a week ago. I was talking with him and I said, confidentially, that there is a plan on foot for a stamp competition and many people would like you to be chairman of the committee. He said that if he is invited, he will accept it.

MR. HUDNUT: Is it a committee that we appoint?



CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We recommend; yes, we recommend to the Postmaster General that he invite, say, Fiske Kimball to be chairman of a committee and that he, then, assemble a jury of five or seven persons representing artists and the Philatelic Society, etc. It would be understood that he would consult with us as to suitable persons for that committee. That committee would be the jury.

MR. HUDNUT: The committee is the jury.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. BIDDLE: They would talk things over with the Post Office Department and thrash out these things.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Technical details; and in making the announcement to the artists, outlining the conditions under which the artists would submit their designs, and how the competition would be conducted.

MR. BIDDLE: We sponsor the thing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: At least we have something started. I do not think we can change the processes of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; certainly not overnight. If they find that they cannot produce a proper stamp from the winning design, then there will be time enough to talk about the process of producing the stamp. But we have got the cooperation of the Post Office Department, rather enthusiastic cooperation, I think, and also the cooperation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I think we ought to go ahead and see what we can do. If it is not to our liking, we can say so later.

MR. HUDNUT: Who appoints this committee?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Postmaster General, but on our recommendation. He wants us to recommend, first of all, the chairman of the committee -- and we would recommend, let us say, Fiske Kimball. Then, as I understand it, Fiske Kimball would meet with us and the representative of the Post Office Department, and perhaps, of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing also -- and choose the jury who would select the design; and then Kimball would conduct the competition.

MR. BIDDLE: Could we quiet some of our fears and say that Fiske Kimball is a fairly intelligent and tactful man.

MR. HUDNUT: You can say that.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. HUDNUT: Three responsible parties now, are there?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Post Office Department.



CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We recommend that we have a committee of five or six persons, representing artists and the Philatelic Society, etc. It would be desirable that he would consult with us as to suitable persons for that committee. That committee would be the jury.

MR. HUDNUT: The committee is the jury.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. BIDDLE: They would talk things over with the Post Office Department and discuss out these things.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Technical details and in carrying the recommendations to the artists, outlining the conditions under which the artist would submit their designs, and how the competition would be conducted.

MR. BIDDLE: We sponsor the thing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: At least we have something started. I think we can change the processes of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing certainly not overnight. If they find that they cannot produce a stamp from the winning design, then there will be time enough to talk with the process of producing the stamp. But we have got the cooperation of the Post Office Department, rather enthusiastic cooperation, I think, and the cooperation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I think we ought to go ahead and see what we can do. If it is not to our liking, we can say so later.

MR. HUDNUT: Who appoints this committee?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Postmaster General. He wants us to recommend, first of all, the chairman of the committee -- and we would recommend, let us say, Mr. Kimball. Then we understand it, I like Kimball, would meet with us and the representatives of the Post Office Department, and perhaps, of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing also -- and choose the jury who would select the design. And then Kimball would conduct the competition.

MR. BIDDLE: Could we just name of our fears -- Mr. Kimball is a fairly intelligent and tactful man.

MR. HUDNUT: You can say that.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. HUDNUT: Three responsible parties now, are there?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Post Office Department.

Mr. HUDNUT: Fiske Kimball and us.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. HUDNUT: I think that would be enough to assure disaster.

MR. FEETS: It may very likely be the Bureau instead of the Post Office Department.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Both, I should think.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Look at it this way. Fiske Kimball is a professional adviser in a competition; that is it. And let us say, the client is Mr. Summerfield, the Post Office Department, and we are the architects. We are the people that sponsor the whole thing and in a sense we will be ultimately responsible to the Post Office because the Post Office Department is not going to say, this is Mr. Fiske Kimball's idea or fault or anything that has happened. I went by the advice of the Fine Arts Commission. So we will be responsible up to that extent. And if you think that Fiske Kimball, I thought he was a good friend of yours.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: He is a good friend of mine. The point is that he has conducted many competitions and is quite competent to do so,

MR. BIDDLE: We are always honest about our friends.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have advocated that competition be conducted for the design of stamps. We have put over that idea for the first time instead of leaving it to the permanent employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to design the stamp as heretofore. We now will have a competition by which the artists have an opportunity to make the designs. That, it seems to me, is an accomplishment that is worth-while.

MR. BIDDLE: I think that something that we have overlooked a little bit that is very important is the assumption that Fiske Kimball appoints a really outstanding jury; and then we have done our job,

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think so, too.

Mr. Biddle: And have done a very, very important job.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I wonder whether he would be a voting member of the jury or whether he should conduct the competition, write the program and listen to our advice as well as the Post Office and then group the thing well so it will be organized, but he will still be only the professional adviser.

MR. BIDDLE: He has had an awful lot of experience. He does not want this to be a failure if he accepts the chairmanship.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Let us go ahead and see what we can do, what we can get out of a competition, the first one to be held in many years.

Mr. HUDNUT: (To Mr. Kinsman) And...

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. HUDNUT: I think that would be enough to create a commission.

Mr. FEETS: It may very likely be the better instead of the latter.  
Office Department

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Both, I should think.

Mr. BELMUSCH: Look at it this way. (To Mr. Kinsman) I am a former advisor in a competition that is it. And let us say the client is the Post Office Department, and we are the architect. We are the people that sponsor the whole thing and in a sense we will be ultimately responsible to the Post Office because the Post Office Department is not going to say, this is Mr. Finley's idea or that or anything. That has happened. I went by the advice of the Fine Arts Commission, so we will be responsible up to that extent. And if you think that I am a good friend of yours.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: He is a good friend of mine. The point is that he has conducted many competitions and is quite competent to do so.

Mr. BIDDLE: We are always honest about our friends.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have advocated that competition be conducted for the design of stamps. We have put over that idea for the first time instead of leaving it to the permanent employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to design the stamp as heretofore. We now will have a competition by which the artist has an opportunity to make the design. That it seems to me is an accomplishment that is worth-while.

Mr. BIDDLE: I think that a meeting that we have overlooked a little bit that is very important is the assumption that I am Kinsman's competitor really outstanding jury and then we have done our job.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think so, too.

Mr. BIDDLE: And have done a very, very important job.

Mr. BELMUSCH: I wonder whether it would be a voting member of the jury or whether he should conduct the competition, write the program and listen to our advice as well as the Post Office and then make the thing well so it will be organized, but he will still be only the "professional" adviser.

Mr. BIDDLE: He has had an awful lot of experience. He does not want this to be a failure if he secures the chairmanship.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Let us go ahead and say what we can do. What we can get out of a competition, the first one to be held in many years.

I did not sense at the meeting that Mr. Hall was irritated. Perhaps we made a mistake in not letting him read our recommendations before our Report was printed. We usually do so in the case of all Government Departments, so we can check and get our ---

MR. CAEMMERER: I think we did.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think every case, before making a statement of fact, that we had it checked by the Department concerned or the agency concerned. I wanted to be very careful not to get out on a limb and make a statement of fact that is not correct.

MR. BIDDLE: How many of this Commission have read the articles by Aline Louchheim in The New York Times about United States Stamps? That is what irritated Hall.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we must go on the assumption that Mr. Hall is going to cooperate and we are going to get a good stamp.

MR. CAEMMERER: He will.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We must not be too severe on his people. Nobody likes to have his people pilloried and say, you have't been any good and now we are going to take over.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That stamp that you showed of the truck, the automobile industry, that was imposed upon them as a lot of these commemorative stamps are. They have someone locally make the picture and then they are told to go ahead and engrave it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Look at this stamp, the Theodore Roosevelt stamp, a commemorative stamp. There is the house and an elm tree. Look at this one down here. Fiftieth Anniversary of the Construction Industry.

MR. BELLUSCHI: They are under pressure and of course, being civil servants --

MR. BIDDLE: They are very happy to have this competition.

MR. PEETS: Were they forced to design that little shield?

MR. BELLUSCHI: This might have been some special society of Roosevelt-Oyster Bay and they have an artist friend of the chairman who did it.

MR. PEETS: That photograph was selected by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing out of the Our World photograph selection or collection.



I did not sense at the meeting that Mr. Hall was irritated. I suppose we made a mistake in not letting him read our recommendations before our Report was printed. We usually do so in the case of all Government Departments, so we can check and get our ---

MR. CAEMMERER: I think we did.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think every case, before making a statement of fact, that we had it checked by the Department concerned or the agency concerned. I wanted to be very careful not to get out on a limb and make a statement of fact that is not correct.

MR. BIDDLE: How many of this Commission have read the article by Aline Moschheim in The New York Times about United States stamps? That is what irritated Hall.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we must go on the assumption that Mr. Hall is going to cooperate and we are going to get a good stamp.

MR. CAEMMERER: He will.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We must not be too severe on his people. Moschheim likes to have his people glorified and say, you haven't seen any good and now we are going to take over.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That stamp that you showed of the truck, the automobile industry, that was imposed upon them as a lot of these commemorative stamps are. They have someone locally make the picture and then they are told to go ahead and engrave it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Look at this stamp, the Theodore Roosevelt stamp, a commemorative stamp. There is the house and an elm tree. Look at this one down here. Fiftieth Anniversary of the Construction Industry.

MR. BELLUSCHI: They are under pressure and of course, being civil servants --

MR. BIDDLE: They are very happy to have this competition.

MR. FEETS: Were they forced to design that little shield?

MR. BELLUSCHI: This might have been some special society of Roosevelt-Oyster Bay and they have an artist friend of the chairman who did it.

MR. FEETS: That photograph was selected by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing out of the Our World photograph selection or collection.



MR. BIDDLE: That is the way they do it.

MR. PEETS: I ran across a very interesting magazine published in Somerville, Massachusetts, which every month gives the full history of new stamps that may have been issued during the month. In such a case as this Roosevelt House, it gave the source of the suggestion and the material they gathered for use by their artists in making it, and three alternative designs which were prepared and submitted to the Post Office Department, and it is extremely illuminating to study those suggested designs.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Who submitted the designs?

MR. PEETS: The Bureau

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Bureau itself?

MR. PEETS: Yes. This magazine is called The Bureau Specialist. In some cases, as many as nine different designs were made by the Bureau and submitted to the Post Office Department before they chose one which might still be the first one they made for use in this stamp. It is extremely interesting to see those alternative designs, and all through them I got a strong impression of the stereotyped, banal, weak approach to the subject.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is about time that something happened.

MR. PEETS: I don't feel that in the end it should be necessary for us to support their organization or their method. It seems to me that their weak point is still the two organizations and that from our proposal of a big shot artist who would be able to walk into either office and throw his weight around, that may not after all be the right one. It may be that the matter of design should be carried much farther in the Post Office Department before it goes to Engraving.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In any event, we are going, as a result of the competition, to furnish them with at least six designs for stamps by outside artists; that is the object we want to accomplish. It might work a revolution in the method to be followed in the future. So let us go ahead and do that and if the method used in engraving the stamp in that design is not satisfactory, then we can come out and say so later.

MR. HUDNUT: I think we must be in a position to say that. We must not get in a position where we cannot say that this is a bad stamp.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We can always do that once the design is turned over to the Bureau. We can say, the design is excellent; the method of producing it, is not.

MR. HUDNUT: We ought to be able to say candidly that we are disappointed in the results -- not get ourselves in a position where we are the sponsors and the prime movers and all that and then we cannot go back on our own records.

MIR. BIDDUL: That is the way they do it

MR. FEET: I ran across a very interesting magazine published in Somerville, Massachusetts, which every month gives the full history of new stamps that may have been issued during the month. In such a case as this Roosevelt House, it gave the account of the suggestion and the material they gathered for use by their artist in making it and some alternative designs which were prepared and submitted to the Post Office Department, and it is extremely illuminating to study those suggested designs

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Who submitted the designs?

MR. FEET: The Bureau

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Bureau itself?

MR. FEET: Yes. This magazine is called The Bureau Spectator. In some cases, as many as nine different designs were made by the Bureau and submitted to the Post Office Department before they chose one which might still be the first one they made for use in this stamp. It is extremely interesting to see those alternative designs, and all through them I got a strong impression of the stereotyped, banal, weak approach to the subject.

MR. BULLUSCH: It is about time that something happened.

MR. FEET: I don't feel that in the end it should be necessary for us to support their organization or their method. It seems to me that the weak point is still the two organizations and that from our proposal of a big shot artist who would be able to walk into either office and make his weight around, that may not after all be the right one. It may be that the matter of design should be carried much farther in the Post Office Department before it goes to engraving.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In any event, we are going, as a result of this competition, to furnish them with at least six designs for stamps by outside artists; that is the object we want to accomplish. It might work out in the method to be followed in the future. So let us go ahead and do that and if the method used in engraving the stamp in this design is not satisfactory, then we can come out and say so later.

MR. HUDNUT: I think we must be in a position to say that we must not get in a position where we cannot say that this is a bad stamp.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We can always do that once the design is turned over to the Bureau. We can say, the design is excellent; the method of producing it is not

MR. HUDNUT: We ought to be able to say candidly that we are disappointed in the results -- not get ourselves in a position where we are the sponsors and the prime movers and all that and then we cannot go back on our own records.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't think we are in such a position, except in organizing the competition. Once it is organized and the committee is formed, or the jury that chooses the designs, we are not involved in responsibility for the choice of the design.

MR. HUDNUT: We did not organize the competition; we advised them to organize it.

MR. BIDDLE: I thought we never protected ourselves by public statements.

MR. HUDNUT: I wouldn't make public statements. I simply say that we should not get ourselves in a position where we are bound to take responsibility for the results.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I never thought we were taking responsibility beyond helping to organize the competition. Mr. Robertson, the Assistant Postmaster General, said that the Postmaster General would invite the designs by the artists; that he would invite Mr. Kimball to act as chairman of the competition; but that he would like to conduct it in cooperation with the Fine Arts Commission. As we are suggesting it and advocating it, it seems to me that we could not refuse such cooperation.

MR. HUDNUT: With the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts. Advice. I use that word over and over again. And not "in cooperation with." But always say he is acting with the advice of the Commission; then you can say he did not follow our advice.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We could put that in the statement.

MR. PEETS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Hudnut whether he believes that we should make quite strong, preferably in writing, the statement that what is being designed is the stamp and not the picture?

MR. HUDNUT: We ought to make that statement and we ought to secure the support of Mr. Kimball before we make it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it would work out this way; that when they have told us the amount of money that is needed and the amount they have on hand, then we would go ahead and try to secure a grant from some foundation for them for the additional funds they will need; then at that point the Post Office would prepare a statement and announce the competition, first submitting it to us so that we can make such corrections as we think desirable.

MR. HUDNUT: I think it should be done at the proper time at the proper place.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We would receive a letter from the Post Office Department enclosing a suggested statement. We would write back and say that we are glad for you to conduct this competition with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts but it must be understood that the artist will

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't think we are in such a position except in organizing the competition. Once it is organized and the committee is formed, or the jury that chooses the designs, we are not involved in responsibility for the choice of the design.

MR. HUDNUT: We did not organize the competition but advised them to organize it.

MR. BIDDLE: I thought we never protected ourselves by public statements.

MR. HUDNUT: I wouldn't make public statements. I think we should not get ourselves in a position where we are bound to the responsibility for the results.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I never thought we were taking responsibility beyond helping to organize the competition. Mr. Robertson, the Postmaster General, said that the Postmaster General would invite the designs by the artists; that he would invite Mr. Kimball to act as chairman of the competition; but that he would like to conduct it in cooperation with the Fine Arts Commission. As we are suggesting it and advocating it, it seems to me that we could not refuse such cooperation.

MR. HUDNUT: With the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts. And I use that word over and over again. And not in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts. And not always say he is acting with the advice of the Commission; then you can say he did not follow our advice.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We could put that in the statement.

MR. FEET: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Hudnut whether he believes that we should make quite strong, pretentiously in writing, the statement that what is being designed is the stamp and not the picture?

MR. HUDNUT: We ought to make that statement and we ought to secure the support of Mr. Kimball before we make it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it would work out this way: that we should have told us the amount of money that is needed and the amount that we have on hand, then we would go ahead and try to secure a grant from some foundation for them for the additional funds they will need. At that point the Post Office would prepare a statement and announce the competition, first submitting it to us so that we can make any corrections we think desirable.

MR. HUDNUT: I think it should be done at the proper time at the proper place.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We would receive a letter from the Post Office Department enclosing a suggested statement. We would write back and say that we are glad for you to conduct this competition with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts but it must be understood that the artist will



submit a design for the stamp, not merely a picture which would be enclosed in a frame supplied by somebody else -- something of that sort.

MR. FEETS: I would feel it was desirable to make our statement as early as possible.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we can do that as soon as we get to the point of exchanging letters with the Post Office Department.

MR. FEETS: I think we should keep in mind that at the present time, pending any correction of the Bureau of Engraving, that the competition is going to be for supplying a picture and not a stamp.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will try and clarify that at the time. Have you received any word as to the funds that will be needed?

MR. CAEMMERER: No; that matter is being looked into by Mr. Hall. I have heard from him and also heard from Mr. Robertson. Mr. Robertson really wants the green light from the Postmaster General and that will probably be forthcoming in a couple of weeks.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: As soon as you do secure the statement as to the amount of funds needed in addition to those available from Government sources, if you could give them to me, I will write to the Rockefeller Foundation and ask if they would consider making a grant.

MR. HUDNUT: David, if Fiske Kimball takes this job he will certainly be in contact with the Post Office Department, will he not?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Oh, yes.

MR. BIDDLE: Don't you think that the important thing is to know the difficulties that he may be up against because he is a very persuasive man.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will ask him to come in and sit with us, if you like, so we can make it quite clear to him.



submit a design for the stamp, and insert a picture which would be enclosed in a frame supplied by somebody else -- something to that effect.

MR. FEET: I would feel it was desirable to take our stamps as early as possible.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we can do that as soon as we get to the point of exchanging letters with the Post Office Department.

MR. FEET: I think we should keep in mind that at the present time pending any correction of the Bureau of Engraving, that the engraving is going to be or supplying a picture and not a stamp.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will try and clarify that at the time. I have you received any word as to the funds that will be needed.

MR. CAMMERBERG: No; that matter is being looked into by Mr. Hall. I have heard from him and also heard from Mr. Robertson. Mr. Robertson really wants the green light from the Postmaster General and he will probably be forthcoming in a couple of weeks.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: As soon as you do secure the statement as to the amount of funds needed in addition to those available from Government sources, if you could give them to me, I will write to the Rockefeller Foundation and ask if they would consider making a grant.

MR. HUDNUT: David, if Mike Mitchell takes this job he will certainly be in contact with the Post Office Department, will he not?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Oh, yes.

MR. BIDDLE: Don't you think that the important thing is to have the difficulties that he may be up against because he is a very persuasive man.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will ask him to come in and sit with us, if you like, so we can make it quite clear to him.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 18, 1953

Dear Mr. Sawyer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 17, 1953, were pleased to inspect the design which you submitted for the proposed Kenilworth Avenue, and Deane Avenue Interchange.

The Commission of Fine Arts approved the design.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Mr. Gerard I. Sawyer,  
Assistant Engineer of Bridges,  
Engineer Department,  
District Building,  
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT F



C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

September 8, 1953

Dear Mr. MacGregor:

Your letter of August 20, with regard to four residences, owned by Georgetown University, namely, 3614-16-18-20 O Street, Northwest, has received very careful consideration by the Committee on Old Georgetown. The members have seen the buildings and are thoroughly familiar with the location.

The Committee have decided that, because of the reasonably good condition of the buildings, and because they are characteristic of the type of buildings found in Old Georgetown; also, because of the durable material in these buildings, which gives them a pleasing appearance, it is not advisable to approve their razing.

The Commission regret the unsanitary conditions that you mentioned as prevailing in the rear yards of the buildings, and hope that the University will take steps to have this condition remedied as pertaining to each of the buildings mentioned.

For The Committee on Old Georgetown:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

Walter M. Macomber, Chairman,  
Committee on Old Georgetown.

Mr. Robert L. MacGregor,  
Business Manager,  
Georgetown University,  
Washington 7, D. C.

EXHIBIT G





C O P Y

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
Washington 7, D. C.

Office of the President

December 16, 1953

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman,  
National Commission of Fine Arts,  
Department of the Interior Building,  
Washington, D. C.

Re: 3614-3616-3618-3620 "O" Street, N. W.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Under date of September 8th, 1953, we received a letter from the Georgetown Fine Arts Commission declining the University's request to raze four row type brick residences at the above addresses.

Mr. MacGregor, our Business Manager, informed me that you requested that we state our position to you. Father Walsh also told me that you visited him and were eager to discuss the subject with me.

Our reason for demolishing these houses is to prepare for the future development program of the University. To rehabilitate them in the light of this program would be a decided economic loss to the University. Ultimately, the University might want to consider development in the entire block, bounded by 36th, 37th, "N" and "O" Streets. It would be a serious handicap if such a program could not be adequately planned should permission to demolish the existing buildings be denied. Georgetown presently owns 90 per cent of the block and it is natural, looking to the future and our present needs, to include this particular site in our planning.

As Chairman of the National Commission of Fine Arts, we are aware of your interest in Georgetown. We share with you a similar and keen interest in maintaining the architectural character of the buildings in the neighborhood. Our greatest pride is our early American tradition as a College established in 1789, which received the first educational charter from the Congress of the United States. During these many years we have tried to maintain the same standards and have made many sacrifices to secure property that was a blemish to Georgetown and to rehabilitate the same. This has been demonstrated, too, in the buildings the University has erected, such as, Copley, White-Gravenor, the New North wing on the campus, the Medical and Dental School, the Hospital, and Poulton Hall.

You can rest assured that should the University in the future erect new buildings in Georgetown as a part of its over-all development they will be in keeping with the others architecturally.

I will consider it a personal favor, and Father Walsh concurs in this, if you bring our request to raze these properties to the attention of the Fine Arts Committee for its reconsideration.

Thanking you for any cooperation you may give us in facilitating the execution of this project, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Edward B. Bunn, S. J.

Ebb/vk

EXHIBIT H



C O P Y

HOWE, FOSTER & SNYDER — ARCHITECTS  
1636 Connecticut Avenue  
Washington 9, D. C.

December 10, 1953

David E. Finley, Esq.  
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts  
Interior Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

With some regret I am offering my resignation from the Committee of Architects set up under authority of the "Old Georgetown Act". While I have found the work very interesting and my association with the other members of the Committee and the staff very pleasant, I have also found that it has taken considerable time, and frequently when I have been busy here at the office. It would seem that after a little more than three years on the Committee it is not unreasonable to ask to be relieved.

In fact, I believe future appointments to the Committee should be made for a definite term in order that new members, possibly with new views, may be available from time to time. Also, this should avoid the embarrassment of resignations.

As you know, I am decidedly interested in Georgetown, both as a property owner and as an architect, and I trust the provisions of the Act will continue to be administered in a constructive manner. I shall be glad to be of any assistance toward this end, even though not on the Committee.

It will be appreciated if my resignation can be effective January 1, 1954.

Respectfully yours,  
Sgd.  
Wm. Dewey Foster

WDF:b

cc - Mr. Caemmerer  
cc - Mr. Macomber  
cc - Mr. Winslow



C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 17, 1953

Dear Mr. Foster:

I have received your letter of December 10th, tendering your resignation from the Committee of Architects which has been advising the Commission of Fine Arts under the authority of the "Old Georgetown Act."

It is with great regret that I accept your resignation effective, as you request, as of January 1, 1954. I realize that you have given a great deal of your time to this work and can understand, with the pressure of other matters at your office, that it would be difficult for you to continue the work with the Commission.

We are most grateful to you for the valuable assistance you have rendered and I know we can count on your continued interest in the welfare of Georgetown. I accept your resignation with great regret, and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Mr. William Dewey Foster  
1636 Connecticut Avenue  
Washington 9, D. C.

def/pav

EXHIBIT I-1





C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 21, 1953

Dear Mr. Warren:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 17, 1953, were glad to inspect and approve the mural painting, by Mitchell Jamieson, in the conference room of your office. The Commission also enjoyed hearing your explanation of the painting which so vividly depicts historical scenes in the state of North Carolina.

It was a happy coincidence that the Commission could inspect the painting with you on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the historical flight of the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Honorable Lindsay C. Warren  
Comptroller General of the  
United States  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D. C.

def/pav

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
 LIBRARY  
 540 EAST 58TH STREET  
 CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

1991 JUN 15 1991

1991 JUN 15 1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
 LIBRARY  
 540 EAST 58TH STREET  
 CHICAGO, ILL. 60637  
 1991 JUN 15 1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
 LIBRARY  
 540 EAST 58TH STREET  
 CHICAGO, ILL. 60637  
 1991 JUN 15 1991

1991 JUN 15 1991

1991 JUN 15 1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
 LIBRARY  
 540 EAST 58TH STREET  
 CHICAGO, ILL. 60637  
 1991 JUN 15 1991

1991 JUN 15 1991

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
7000 Interior Department Building  
Washington D. C.

December 18, 1953

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 17, 1953, were pleased to inspect the mural painting by Mitchell Jamieson in the conference room of the Comptroller General, in the General Accounting Office. Messrs. Allan S. Thorn, and L. L. Hunter of your Office were present.

The Commission were well pleased with the painting, and approved it. If there is one suggestion the Commission would offer, it is to reaffirm a suggestion made a year or two ago that some additional mural paintings be provided at the entrances of the building. If that can be done, we will be glad to consider the matter with you.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,  
Sgd.  
David E. Finley,  
Chairman.

Honorable W. E. Reynolds,  
Commissioner of Public Buildings  
Service,  
General Services Administration,  
Washington 25, D. C.





MANILA MILITARY CEMETERY

Discussion at Meeting in General North's Office  
December 17, 1953

MR. HARBESON: Gentlemen, on the occasion of the last submission to you of the proposal for the Manila Cemetery you made certain recommendations, principally two. The original model which you see there was based on having a single center for the curve on which the field is laid out. The tower was ~~106 feet~~ <sup>108 feet</sup> too high. I think you recommended action that we try using two centers. You recommended lowering of the tower. Both of these things have been done. Ref 1/25/54

This model, which is double the scale of that, shows the divided center here and the lowering of this building. The tower ~~was 106 feet high.~~ It is now shown half as high. Here you see the centers. The width overall is just the same; ~~The~~ change has been made by reducing dimension on the main axis. The drawings are behind you. (This model has not been carried as far as the other one.) There are still to be openings in the roof of the four map chambers as ~~they were~~ originally shown, but Mr. Dailey did not have time to do so. The distance across the back of the tower platform is the same as the distance across the platform on the earlier model. Mr. Dailey has tried to follow out what you recommended and he says he feels ~~it is very much better.~~ <sup>the result is</sup>

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What is the material of the building?

MR. HARBESON: Originally, it was ~~supposed~~ <sup>intended</sup> to be concrete. Your commission recommended against the use of concrete so other materials are now being investigated. There is a marble produced in Manila; I believe General North says that, if necessary, stone or marble can be imported so that the thing will be built of materials that are suitable. Of course, the slabs in the hemicycles on which the names of the missing occur were to be of precious material in any case; after making a study at the sites, Mr. Dailey agrees



that concrete would not be suitable because it acquires a fungus, which turns black—and is very unprepossessing. He proposes on the front a mosaic, the detail of which, ~~of course~~, has not been studied so far. Behind you are drawings which show in detail what he is considering. These show the two centers used in plan. Underneath you will find details of the other parts of the architecture carried only this far—obviously, he will make further study. On the vertical slabs the names of the missing will occur, some 30,000 of them. (The actual number cannot be determined yet).

MR. BELLUSCHI: There has been another change in the names?

MR. HARBESON: The number is not yet finally determined. The slabs go from floor to ceiling. The outside is now a curtain wall; the openings are not windows as we normally think of them as there is no lintel showing, nor any parapet at the floor. There will be benches there as protection against change of grade.

MR. PEETS: Wasn't there strengthening of construction from either earthquake or such disturbance?

MR. HARBESON: The reinforced concrete will be figured to care for earthquakes. The original design showed freestanding slabs; you lose that in the new design.

MR. PEETS: We liked that very much.

MR. BELLUSCHI: This is a column so that we lose the immediacy and strength.

MR. HARBESON: The studies went through an intermediate stage where the opening was in the center.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I would understand if this was separated, if the column and the outside wall were freestanding; but this way it seems to me it is very pedestrian.



MR. HARBESON: I suggested he go back to the earlier idea and he has promised. I think he would be perfectly open to suggestions you might care to recommend to him. I am sure he would study in that direction.

MR. PEETS: Without being there to see the thing —

MR. HARBESON: He may have had the thought that it was too open; if one were here and looking out from the court, that the building did not have enough substance.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I don't think you get much more substance now. You are taking away from the detail a little bit. The early scheme was a very direct statement. Now they became actually openings in a wall.

MR. HARBESON: Perhaps what led him in this direction was consideration of costs, especially as he has to make it of stone —

In the early scheme there was a passage around the outside of the hemicycle, and now there is a drop in grade at that place. I suppose he came to this to care for the grade; I suggested he put railings there between the wall and he apparently objected to the railings and suggested the benches.

MR. PEETS: You will see on the drawings that he proposed to put benches there. It does show that way, yes; but on the drawings you will see the changes in benches. He probably had this model made before he considered that. Here, for instance, you see that is a change in the character of the floor and that was his answer there and he probably had the model already made. But as he sees it, he does get a piece of wall there instead of this blank treatment and this especially this came a little bit out. It was a very frank treatment. There is considerable simplification over the other plan, all to the good.

MR. HARBESON: Here is the other plan which he first sent, which showed this passage near the inner line of piers. This is again much more functional. The light is coming in this way; the center is the dark place, a natural place





to arrange the passage.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I am just thinking out loud now. If we had these slabs then the benches, I don't mind that; I think it is good; but if you then separate the pier from the slab and the wall from the slab, there would be lintels spanning here, on the inside and on the outside line.

MR. HARBESON: You would have the passage in the center and openings between the name slabs and the supporting members.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That is freestanding. Then I wouldn't mind this. But as it stands now, this, to me, a wall that goes into a pier --

MR. HARBESON: It is not as frank.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Why not make it a suggestion.

MR. HARBESON: All right. You have two different thoughts. One of them that the pier be as he has done it, separated from the name slabs by openings.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It appears that these are the supports and these are the monumental slabs.

MR. HARBESON: There is a change of level. If the openings are in the center and there might be a heavy rain, you can walk from one end to the other and you can occupy the time during the rain. Rain sometimes lasts for three or four hours. Whereas, if the passage is near the edge you would have to jump around the end to keep dry. It would not be as dignified. Your alternate suggestion, as I understood it, was to retain the original proposal, the name slabs being the supports.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That's right.

MR. HARBESON: Couldn't those two things be suggested to him for further study?

MR. PEETS: Now, that picture is very attractive, isn't it? Don't you consider that part of the attractiveness, is the kind of a pergola feeling that you can walk around?



MR. HARBESON: The early scheme is frank and the later is less so. That is perfectly true.

MR. BELLUSCHI: He is a good architect.

MR. HARBESON: A grand person.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Regarding the tower, I have to give my reaction and I think that as to the height, I agree with you; but I do not feel that that treatment of mosaic is very good, very solid. It is sort of a little bit of a stunt to put mosaic arbitrarily in this section. The first submission shows much more dignity, tends to be its own as a unit. The new scheme has a connotation of being transitory. I would prefer it as all mosaic or all straight, or mosaic in a band or something. Somehow, to have it in pylon leaves me very unhappy.

MR. HARBESON: I think Mr. Dailey will be glad to study it again from that point of view.

MR. PEETS: Those vertical members at the sides of the mosaic are weak, too small.

MR. HARBESON: It comes pretty close to three even divisions. You do approve the cutting down of the height?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I don't know how we began that. Do you remember that? You did have a good reason for it.

MR. PEETS: That was a long time ago. We ought to have, perhaps, the transcript. I can tell you from looking at them.

MR. HARBESON: I may say that after you had made the recommendation of reducing the height, Mr. Dailey has been over there, and has found that this tower is not very far from the airport of Manila, and it is in the direction of one of the runways; at that height they would require one of those flashing beacons; Mr. Dailey felt that that would not be dignified, and that the lower





tower is very much better from that point of view.

MR. PEETS: Let me see, where is the plan?

MR. HARBESON: That is the old plan, yes. Of course, at that time he had a stair going up to the top, which is out now. There would not be enough money to put an elevator, and in that climate nobody will walk to the top, and he says you get just as good a view from the plaza in any case.

MR. PEETS: Was that platform being raised?

MR. HARBESON: He has brought that down. Perhaps that was in your report.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That I liked, yes; but I do not want to contradict what we did before. I do not remember just the cutting of the tower itself. Is the new tower the maximum height that will be allowed?

MR. HARBESON: The other one would have to have a flashing beacon.

MR. BELLUSCHI: No flashing beacon, that is the maximum height above which you cannot go?

MR. HARBESON: I can't tell you. They may be able to go a little higher. Would you like it higher if you could? This is fifty feet.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I must say that I don't mind too much. I think it could stand to be a little bit higher and it could be. The mosaic matter is something of extreme seriousness and I am resentful of trying any sort of cheapness that you would not expect in this kind of memorial. There should be maintained a kind of program.

MR. HARBESON: You would not object if the ornamentation were all one color, perhaps some sculpture in low relief?

MR. BELLUSCHI: No; that would be fine. A sculptor could do the whole facade, the whole panel.

MR. de WELDON: In stone.

MR. BELLUSCHI: A feeling of unity would be preserved. With mosaic, you



have two which divides it almost the same which cheapens it.

MR. de WEIDON: I think the length of inscriptions should be very carefully considered.

MR. HARBESON: That will have to be submitted further; obviously the text for inscription has not been chosen yet. Yes, that is very important.

MR. de WEIDON: The design of the lettering should be submitted.

MR. HARBESON: Yes, that can be done. ~~Lettering is important.~~

MR. BELLUSCHI: I feel that having the flashing light for the airport might be a handicap but I would go as high as would be allowed.

MR. HARBESON: There is no question about the improvement resulting from having the two centers.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think so. That was excellent.

MR. PEETS: It brings to mind Bernini's Piazza San Pietro.

MR. HARBESON: This court is about two thirds the size of the Piazza San Pietro.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That is large.

MR. HARBESON: That all grew from the area required for putting 30,000 names of missing.

MR. CAEMMERER: What is the height of the ceiling? I refer to those columns, those steles.

MR. HARBESON: Twenty feet. I guess we ought to look at his new drawings.

MR. CAEMMERER: That is near enough.

MR. HARBESON: Eighteen feet.

MR. CAEMMERER: What is the distance from here to here, the distance from this point to this point?

MR. HARBESON: The distance in the new scheme from front to back of the court is 297 feet and the width is 325 feet.



MR. CAEMMERER: Does that mean from there to there, around?

MR. HARBESON: When carried around, 297, and here it is 325 feet from the face to face.

MR. CAEMMERER: Well now, what kind of stone are you going to use?

MR. HARBESON: It might be marble. There is Romblon marble which is produced in Manila, marble of very good quality and several colors. You can get white like Carrera or various colors. But whether it can be produced in quantity is still a thing to be determined. After the Romblon quarry was given the contract to produce crosses, they produced fourteen crosses that were acceptable. Perhaps the contract will have to be abrogated.

MR. CAEMMERER: You have 30,000 unknown?

MR. HARBESON: Yes. That is for all of the Pacific. It has to take in China, Burma, India, the island-hopping, the taking of Japan, all the Navy action in the Pacific, and so on.

MR. CAEMMERER: Then in addition, you have 20,000 burials.

MR. HARBESON: Not quite: 17,000 now. There were at one time 20,000. Would you like to look at those drawings underneath? This is the old scheme.

MR. BELLUSCHI: This is the new scheme?

MR. HARBESON: Yes, that is the new one.

MR. HUDNUT: Isn't the opening at the front of the court wider than shown on the model?

MR. HARBESON: I think not. We can soon tell. It is about six feet wider.

MR. HUDNUT: I would like to bring these walls up for a better ending of the enclosure.

MR. PEETS: The opening is too wide.

MR. HUDNUT: I think so. There is no reason why this should be symmetrical at the two ends of the main axis, you know. But the other end is filled





in by a feature. I think you will find that this has the effect of a wide gap which kills the feeling of continuity and enclosure.

MR. HARBESON: Mr. Dailey has tried to make the enclosure with this planting here. His model was done in a great hurry but there was intended to be planting. You feel that would not do it well enough?

MR. HUDNUT: Is this his planting? Is it high?

MR. PEETS: This, is this a parapet wall?

MR. HARBESON: Yes, that is a parapet wall. I understood there were trees behind it. General North, could we borrow the tree plans?

MR. PEETS: Some are existing trees.

MR. HARBESON: They would show. Mr. Dailey has very complete planting plans and I am sure he would indicate what is there.

MR. PEETS: I would not especially want the planting there. I think it is a point to be considered, almost disregarding them. That opening is so much stronger than any planting would be. I am inclined not to protest against that. What scale is that?

MR. HARBESON: Sixteenth scale.

MR. PEETS: That would be about 150 feet.

MR. HARBESON: The inside size is 125 feet and the outside is 150, just as you said.

MR. PEETS: Then out here the ground falls, doesn't it?

MR. HARBESON: Yes; it drops away and then, of course, the entrance and exit drives are there and there will be some place for parking nearby.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Don't you think it has some importance as you stand here that these two compose -- if it is too narrow you might <sup>lose</sup> ~~use~~ some of the feeling of enclosure but with a strong planting here or high parapet, without interfering with the view.



MR. PEETS: It is a question. Without offering any judgment, I am just discussing the thing in order to analyze it, the reason for the use of two centers in the shorter radius is to make it look more as if it were a circle. If this opening is widened in direct proportion as it is widened, this piece of the curvature loses relation to this. If it came back here, it would have a tendency to give you the impression that it was flowing loose and was coming out like that. ~~It looks as if it was coming out like that.~~

MR. HUDNUT: Just <sup>whether</sup> ~~where~~ you want to have the effect of two brackets coming out like that, or whether you want to have the effect of a circle -- now you are getting so wide that the oval form is gone.

MR. HARBESON: Do you feel that in the model?

MR. HUDNUT: More than in the drawing, yes.

MR. PEETS: Can we look at the back of the model?

MR. HARBESON: Yes, indeed. Do you feel the oval there?

MR. PEETS: It seems pretty close to it. This is just research, you know. I have not any feeling yet as far as I am concerned.

MR. HUDNUT: I like the way it is done there.

MR. PEETS: I would say that that opening down there should not be another inch wide. I am not so strong about it that I would say if it was ten feet more, it would be all right. So you see, I am on your side. Put up a little card of something so that we can show that. We should get down as close as possible.

MR. HUDNUT: You ought to try to do it more closely. There is a reduction of tension that you have with this spring. You get much more tension than if you get the continuity there.

MR. PEETS: That opening, I would say, is pretty close to -- the opening as it is in that model is about the same proportion as it is in San Pietro.





MR. BELLUSCHI: San Pietro is quite wide.

MR. PEETS: Bernini was beginning to put in a section.

MR. HUDNUT: I like that better, putting the paper in there to reduce it.

MR. PEETS: What is the scale as compared to this one?

MR. HARBESON: 90 feet. Assume that these are the same — 90 feet.

MR. PEETS: What is it across here?

MR. HARBESON: Across there, 96.

MR. PEETS: Is that right?

MR. HARBESON: You would have stone there instead of plantings?

MR. PEETS: That would have to be enlarged in units of panel separation so that there would either have to be one or two.

MR. HARBESON: One on each side. Perhaps this is a little bit large.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Does he have working drawings made of this yet?

MR. HARBESON: Just what you saw behind you.

MR. HUDNUT: That end unit could be a little thicker, a little heavier.

MR. HARBESON: Yes, this historical room could be wider, yes; you could come and go in that.

MR. PEETS: It is wider on the other side.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I don't feel terribly unhappy but I like the other just enough better to advocate it.

MR. PEETS: I think we all agree on that. Let us say, one or two bays.

MR. HUDNUT: Approximately 90 feet; he can work it out. Approximately 90 feet in the inside circle.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Still 125; be about 35 feet.

MR. PEETS: I remember you intended to save some big trees.

MR. HARBESON: These are existing there.

MR. CAEMMERER: How many acres are you taking in in that area? Have you figured it out?

1. The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the plane was the fresh air.

2. It felt like I had been in a bubble for the last few days.

3. The sun was shining brightly, and the birds were singing.

4. I took a deep breath and felt a sense of relief.

5. The road ahead was long, but I knew I could make it.

6. I started walking, and the world opened up to me.

7. The trees were tall and green, and the water was clear.

8. I felt like I had found a new home.

9. The people were friendly, and the food was delicious.

10. I was finally home, and I knew I was where I belonged.

11. The night was quiet, and the stars were shining.

12. I closed my eyes and felt a sense of peace.

13. The morning came, and I was ready to start my new life.

14. The sun was rising, and the world was waking up.

15. I was finally home, and I knew I was where I belonged.

16. The night was quiet, and the stars were shining.

17. I closed my eyes and felt a sense of peace.

18. The morning came, and I was ready to start my new life.

19. The sun was rising, and the world was waking up.

20. I was finally home, and I knew I was where I belonged.

21. The night was quiet, and the stars were shining.

22. I closed my eyes and felt a sense of peace.

23. The morning came, and I was ready to start my new life.

24. The sun was rising, and the world was waking up.

25. I was finally home, and I knew I was where I belonged.

26. The night was quiet, and the stars were shining.

GENERAL NORTH: One hundred and fifty, almost exactly -- 149.9.

MR. HARBESON: There is another conclusion you might consider before you come to a conclusion about that. This is the relation to this if you come further out with this thing.

MR. PEETS: That would be in favor of narrowing this perspective if you draw the lines from here out this way. The lines are not parallel. They are at a certain point here and then you go out and it would have to be much narrower than this to look the same. It would require a little adjustment.

MR. HUDNUT: Do you have snow in Manila?

MR. HARBESON: Practically none, no. I think it happened once. Nor did it lie when it did come that one time.

MR. PEETS: He comes from northern Maine -- snow country.

MR. HARBESON: Well, are you all agreed as to that question of the opening? Let us get that dimension that you were talking about.

MR. PEETS: On the supposition that it was about 125.

MR. HARBESON: I may still be too high. That would be 100.

MR. PEETS: That would be about one bay.

MR. HARBESON: Yes. This is 98 feet, as a matter of fact. Ninety feet would be just a little bit smaller than that. I am not as good at mathematics as I should be. Here we are. That is about one bay.

MR. PEETS: This would have to be a little bit more, but it need not be in proportion. Is it not correct that this should not be very close to this? It should be definitely more or definitely less and probably less.

MR. HARBESON: As you say, changing in the size of the historical room could be used to adjust the proportion. Now would you like to have him make studies along those lines?

MR. HUDNUT: I don't think he has to do that. Do you think so?

MR. BELLUSCHI: No. I would like to know his reaction to it, if it comes



fresh.

MR. PEETS: Just think what a beautiful impression it creates to walk through there being flanked on both sides.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I like that very much.

MR. PEETS: I like it very much.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It seems to me in this case he has wandered. I am wondering whether you could leave this and since he has more room to simply disengage this and this from this — if he is very set on preserving the pier effect rather than the edge of the steles — to keep away even eight inches or ten inches to give independence to the two things. It seems to me that that was one of the good things, to have those act as pieces.

MR. HARBESON: You are probably right.

MR. BELLUSCHI: This would be a third alternative if he is very set on having external piers, having this and this; then I would disengage and keep these as really monumental.

MR. HUDNUT: If you made these things of glass with the letters burned in in gold, you would have a perfectly stunning effect. It would not cost more than to have marble.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It might be a wonderful thing for kids to throw rocks at.

~~It takes a little work but it makes it much more satisfactory to us.~~

MR. HUDNUT: Why wouldn't they throw at the marble, then?

MR. PEETS: Do you suppose that the motivation back of these bits of wall here is this, that since there is a heavy drop at this point there has to be a barrier at that point? He started out putting a building, started out building a low wall; then he felt that that low wall just running into this radiating wall was weak and he felt he should strengthen it but running up kind of a jamb or whatever you call it, up to the top. But I wouldn't feel that it would be bad to have these walls come right there and stop.





MR. BELLUSCHI: First choice.

MR. PEETS: And even have a parapet or continuous seat all the way across there.

MR. BELLUSCHI: The seat would be swell there but I was looking at that rather carefully on this last model and he has one plane; his head and his walls and his sill, whatever it is on the south, is all on one plane which is a continuation of this solid motif. So he might have a very strong feeling about that. If that is the case, then as a third choice, it would be better to keep these as pieces of sculpture, almost sculpturally like the names are, rather than make this a pier as this is, a wall of a small room which comes there and meets with the window and opening — sort of cheapens.

MR. HUDNUT: It would be very elegant if you had trees there.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Just enough to be free.

MR. HUDNUT: I agree with you. There is something very subtle about that.

MR. BELLUSCHI: He has three choices, in a way.

MR. HUDNUT: Suggest a little pedestrian.

MR. HARBESON: General North took these photographs not too long ago.

Nothing very much has been done. Those are the existing trees that you asked about. They are a little hard to pick out but they are there. You are agreed as to the hemicycles?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I don't feel too strongly about it. But I am a little unhappy about the tower, about the size of the tower. I would like to make it taller. So I think really there should not be that light on top; but if you can go a little higher and get more unity and dignity in it, fine. That looks nice from this. It is nothing but a simple shaft.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you gentlemen covered the subject?

MR. BELLUSCHI: There were three or four suggestions on the height of the tower and narrowing the gap and two or three suggestions.



CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are you in a hurry for a decision?

MR. BELLUSCHI: You could send his reply and let us know which way he thinks.

MR. HARBESON: We will.

MR. PEETS: Let us say we are not making any requirements. We raised these points for his own determination.

GENERAL NORTH: Any solution would please you.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Why don't you write a letter to the Commission saying what you can do in accordance with these suggestions.

MR. CAELMERER: We can send the text of all this material to Mr. Harbeson and to General North.

MR. HARBESON: That would be fine.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is there anything else, gentlemen? If not, we have enjoyed our visit with you, General North, and with you, Mr. Harbeson.

GENERAL NORTH: It has been a pleasure.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)





Public Relations

December 17, 1953

Mr. BELLUSCHI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss for a moment a matter which was brought up before you came, a question of public relations concerning our Commission.

Mr. Christopher Tunnard, who is a professor of landscape architecture at Yale, came up to Boston last week to give a lecture to our students; the title of his lecture was "What Killed Civic Art?" Among other things he mentioned the Howell bill and how wonderful it would be for our country if it should be enacted; he asked everybody to support it and said that the Fine Arts Commission was against it for some obscure but unholy reason, implying that its members were too conservative and inept and opposed the bill for selfish reasons or because they did not understand how important it is for the government to give support to the Arts.

It is not sufficient that we say that the Howell bill has some good features but we are against others. I think we should be more specific in giving the reasons for our stand and more outspoken in letting the people know why certain things in the bill will not work.

Perhaps it is not easy to give such reasons because we would have to say that the political complexion of that kind of a bill in our democratic society would never be free of political pressure and therefore would do more harm than good to the cause of creative art. Yet somehow it seems to me we should give our reasons with courage and clarity rather than just simply say: we stand by our report. I don't think many people read the report. When Mr. Goodrich says in many ways to so many people that art should be encouraged, everybody certainly would agree; when he also says that there are some people who are against it and the Fine Arts Commission is one of them, that puts us immediately in an awful light with the many who by direct inference will think we do not want to encourage Art, without ever knowing our good reasons for opposing that particular bill.

Maybe we can't do anything about it now, but somehow it seems to me it is worth finding out whether we can or not.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If we can make our position clear to the public, I think we should so so, but I do not think you will be able to convince Goodrich as to the soundness of your views about this bill. I cannot convince him even as to the composition of the Advisory Panel of Experts. He wrote me that he refused to recognize Wheeler Williams and Mr. Brinckerhoff, the representatives of the National Sculpture Society, as members of the Advisory Panel, so how can you convince him of anything? There is quite a propaganda in certain circles to have the Howell bill become law. I have been misrepresented about the whole matter.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I know.

February 17, 1933

MR. BELMUSCH: I would like to discuss for a moment a matter which was brought up before you some time ago, a question of public relations concerning our Commission.

Mr. Christopher Tarnard, who is a professor of landscape architecture at Yale, came up to Boston last week to give a lecture to our society. The title of his lecture was "What Killed Civic Art." Among other things he mentioned the Howell bill and now wonderful it would be for a man who it should be expected; he asked everybody to support it and that the Fine Arts Commission was against it for some obscure but nobody reason. Implying that its members were too conservative and had a kind of narrow-mindedness for selfish reasons or because they did not understand how important it is for the government to give support to the Arts.

It is not sufficient that we say that the Howell bill has some good features but we are against others. I think we should be more specific in giving the reasons for our stand and more outspoken in telling the people how why certain things in the bill will not work.

Perhaps it is not easy to give such reasons because we would have to say that the political complexion of that kind of a bill in our democratic society would never be free of political pressure and therefore would do more harm than good to the cause of creative art. Yet somehow it seems to me we should give our reasons with courage and clarity rather than just simply say: we stand by our report. I don't think many people read the report. When Mr. Goodrich says in many ways to so many people that they should be encouraged, everybody, certainly would agree; when he also says that there are some people who are against it and the Fine Arts Commission is one of them, that puts us immediately in an awkward light with the many who by direct inference will think we do not want to encourage Art. Without ever knowing our good reasons for opposing that particular bill.

Maybe we can't do anything about it now, but somehow it seems to me it is worth finding out whether we can or not.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If we can make our position clear to the public, I think we should so, but I do not think you will be able to convince Goodrich as to the soundness of your views about this bill. I cannot convince him even as to the composition of the Advisory Panel of Experts. He wrote me that he refused to recognize Wheeler Williams and Mr. Bruckner, the representatives of the National Sculpture Society, as members of the Advisory Panel, so how can you convince him of anything? There is quite a propaganda in certain circles to have the Howell bill become law. I have been misrepresented about the whole matter.

MR. BELMUSCH: I know.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Even in the papers here. A story came out in the Washington Post that "Finley is opposed to an opera house in Washington" because I was not in favor of the Howell bill.

We are in favor of an opera house, of course, as I had written in reply to a letter I had received from a man named Verueffy. In my letter, I said that the Fine Arts Commission had advocated in our Report to the President, the establishment of an opera house in Washington. And yet I was represented in the paper as opposing an opera house. You can't convince people who misrepresent your own position.

MR. HUDNUT: Could I make a suggestion there? Why don't we have a rival bill for an opera house which is the kind of bill we would like? Can't we get a Congressman to bring in a bill for an opera house?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: There is such a bill. Mr. Kearns introduced a bill like that.

MR. HUDNUT: Let us all support that, then.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is exactly what we want.

MR. HUDNUT: Come out in the paper and say we are in favor and play it up so that you have got a positive action against them, not just negative; but we are for this bill and our reasons for it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think the Commission have approved the Kearns bill, haven't we?

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes. It is pending in Congress.

MR. HUDNUT: We can back that vociferously; that will clear out the whole situation.

MR. BELLUSCHI: One word there, vociferously. We stand on the record for good against evil and all that, but very few people know it because the things are so hot in regard to the Howell bill.

MR. HUDNUT: There should be a way of letting the people know our reasons for opposing the Howell bill, rather than just stand on our dignity and say nothing. People think of us as a bunch of reactionaries that are against what is good for the country.

MR. HUDNUT: You can say what is wrong with that bill, but the public, you are attacking it, and instead of attacking it you are mad to have an opera house.

Mr. Belluschi: It isn't a question of opera house alone. It is a question of the whole idea of setting up, say, a Ministry of Fine Arts.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Even in the papers here, a story seems to be in the Washington Post that Finley is opposed to an opera house in Washington because I was not in favor of the Howell bill.

We are in favor of an opera house, of course, and I had written a letter to a letter I had received from a man named Kennedy. In my letter I said that the Fine Arts Commission had advocated in our report to the President, the establishment of an opera house in Washington. And yet I was represented in the paper as opposing an opera house. You can't come people who misrepresent your own position.

MR. HUDNUT: Could I make a suggestion to you? Why don't we have a rival bill for an opera house which is the kind of bill we would like to get a Congressman to bring in a bill for an opera house?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: There is such a bill. Mr. Keating introduced a bill like that.

MR. HUDNUT: Let us all support that, then.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is exactly what we want.

MR. HUDNUT: Come out in the paper and say we are in favor of it. Play it up so that you have got a positive action against them, not just negative; but we are for this bill and our reasons for it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think the Commission have approved the Keating bill, haven't we?

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes. It is pending in Congress.

MR. HUDNUT: We can back that vociferously; that will clear out the whole situation.

MR. BELMUSCH: One word there, vociferously. We stand on the record for good against evil and all that, but very few people know it. The things are so hot in regard to the Howell bill.

MR. HUDNUT: There should be a way of giving the people more reasons for opposing the Howell bill, rather than just stand on our dignity and say nothing. People think of us as a bunch of reactionaries that are against what is good for the country.

MR. HUDNUT: You can say what is wrong with that bill, but the whole idea of attacking it, and instead of attacking it you are men to have an opera house.

MR. BELMUSCH: It isn't a question of opera house alone. It is a question of the whole idea of setting up, say, a Ministry of Fine Arts.



Mr. Hudnut: But the issue in public is the opera house.

Mr. Belluschi: No; the issue has everything to do with the arts, encouraging the arts and --

Mr. Biddle: I don't think most of the public knows there is an opera house connected with it.

Chairman Finley: Support for the Howell bill comes largely from a group of people who want the Government to appropriate \$20 million a year for art, even though many of them do not like the manner in which the funds would be administered. They are fascinated by the prospect of the money.

Mr. Belluschi: Not the art organizations.

Mr. Hudnut: Let's get up a bill for \$50 million.

Mr. Biddle: I do think with Belluschi that better public relations could do a lot for the commission and it would have nothing to do with Goodrich because I think that is a perfectly negative approach.

I think that any positive, creative measures that we back, if we let the art organizations of the country know about it, it will help us; and I was just saying to Pietro before the meeting that I think one excellent example of that at the proper moment would be if you or some other, Pietro or anybody else, could write some articles to some of the art magazines about this Post Office competition, I think that would receive enormously favorable enthusiasm from the different art organizations.

Chairman Finley: I think that is a good idea and as soon as the competition is announced, that could be done.

I do not believe, however, that this will counteract the advocacy of these people who want the \$20 million. The only effective thing would be for the art organizations to disapprove the setting up of a bureaucracy.

Mr. Biddle: That is negative. Everything we do to show that we are favoring art in a positive way would be a good thing.

Chairman Finley: We are advocating and in my letter I said, that we wanted an opera house. I also said that we had recommended a building for the National Collection of Fine Arts so that contemporary artists would be recognized and patronized by the Government; at least their works would be acquired by the Government. These certainly are constructive ideas.

Mr. Belluschi: There are a lot of constructive things in your report which are somewhat buried. Even an intelligent person such as Aline Louchheim, when I talked to her two or three months ago, her reaction



Mr. Hudson: But the issue is the opera house.

Mr. Belin: No; the issue has everything to do with the arts and --  
encouraging the arts and --

Mr. Bidder: I don't think most of the public knows there is an opera house connected with it.

Chairman Finley: Support for the Howell Bill comes largely from a group of people who want the Government to appropriate \$20 million a year for art, even though many of them do not like the manner in which the funds would be administered. They are fascinated by the prospect of the money.

Mr. Belin: Not the art organizations.

Mr. Hudson: Let's get up a bill for \$50 million.

Mr. Bidder: I do think with Belin that better public relations could do a lot for the commission and it would have nothing to do with Goodrich because I think that is a perfectly negative approach.

I think that any positive, creative measures that we take, if we let the art organizations of the country know about it, it will help us and was just saying to Pietro before the meeting that I think one excellent example of that at the proper moment would be if you or some other, or anybody else, could write some articles to some of the art magazines about this Post Office competition. I think that would receive enormous favorable enthusiasm from the different art organizations.

Chairman Finley: I think that is a good idea and as soon as the commission is announced, that could be done.

I do not believe, however, that this will counteract the advocacy of these people who want the \$20 million. The only effective thing would be for the art organizations to disapprove the setting up of a pure money

Mr. Bidder: That is negative. Everything we do to show that we are favoring art in a positive way would be a good thing.

Chairman Finley: We are advocating and in my letter I said, that we wanted an opera house. I also said that we had recommended a building for the National Collection of Fine Arts so that contemporary artists would be recognized and patronized by the Government; at least their works would be acquired by the Government. These certainly are constructive ideas.

Mr. Belin: There are a lot of constructive things in your report which are somewhat buried. Even an intelligent person such as I, in Touchheim, when I talked to her two or three months ago, her reaction

was probably second hand that the report was terribly conservative and against this and that. That is what I would like to, even just write that we are encouraging art, encouraging exhibitions, traveling exhibitions, of museums, and that if there are 30 million available they should be given, as they are in England, to an independent council, not to politicians to use for their political advancement.

Mr. Biddle: You can go much further than that in the preliminary draft of this report of the Committee on Government and Art. They have stated more than once that they agree with all the objectives in your report. The only thing they disagree with is the question of implementation. I think, for instance, at the proper moment a letter from us, an open letter from you to that committee, stating that, would do a great deal in the eyes of the public to show that your point of view is not nearly as divergent as was suggested by those early newspaper statements.

Chairman Finley: George, the Committee on Government and Art, as you will remember, had a meeting in New York which you and I both attended and I explained many of those things to the members of the committee who were there, I explained them as clearly as I could. And they appointed a committee which is going to make a report to themselves, the Committee on Government and Art, on our report, setting forth their views. They invited me to be a member of this committee but I thought it was not proper to do so, as they expect to criticize our report, so I declined.

Then they asked me to sit in on the meeting. I thought it was not worthwhile going to New York to do that. Let them formulate their own views about the report and write a letter of which, I assume, they will send us a copy. They have never sent the Commission a copy of their report as members of our Advisory Panel. The Advisory Panel has never sent a copy and Goodrich has refused to send a copy of that report of the Advisory Panel to the Commission of Fine Arts. He said: "I have sent a copy to you and George and that is sufficient." So what can you do with a situation like that?

Mr. Biddle: I don't care what you do with him personally. I pointed out to him a number of times yesterday == they had another meeting -- that they are in about 96 percent agreement with the general objectives as stated in the Commission report and as far as amplifying it, with my statement of reservations, well, I said if that is the case, why don't you say that you do agree with the report?

Mr. Belluschi: He does the opposite. He condemned the report, almost in toto. One gets the impression --

Mr. Biddle: But they are gradually coming to the ~~opion~~ opinion that they agree to the report.

was probably second hand that the report was terribly conservative and against this and that. That is what I would like to, even just with the are encouraging art, encouraging exhibitions, the being addition of museums, and that if there are 30 million available they should be given as they are in England, to an independent council, not to politicians to be for their political advancement.

Mr. Biddle: You can go much further than that in the preliminary draft of this report of the Committee on Government and Art. They have stated more than once that they agree with all the objectives in our report. The only thing they disagree with is the question of implementation. I think, for instance, at the present moment a letter from us, an open letter from you to that committee, stating that, would do a great deal in the eyes of the public to show that your point of view is not nearly as divergent as was suggested by those early newspaper statements.

Chairman Finley: George, the Committee on Government and Art, as you will remember, had a meeting in New York which you and I both attended and I explained many of those things to the members of the committee who were there. I explained them as clearly as I could. And they appointed a committee which is going to make a report to themselves, the Committee on Government and Art, on our report, settling forth their view. They invited me to be a member of this committee but I thought it was not proper to do so, as they expect to criticize our report, so I declined.

Then they asked me to sit in on the meeting. I thought it was not worthwhile going to New York to do that. But then formulate their own views about the report and write a letter of which, I assume, they will send us a copy. They have never sent the Commission a copy of their report as members of our Advisory Panel. The Advisory Panel has never sent a copy and Goodrich has refused to send a copy of that report of the Advisory Panel to the Commission of Fine Arts. He said: "I have sent a copy to you and George and that is sufficient." So what can you do with a situation like that?

Mr. Biddle: I don't care what you do with him personally. I pointed out to him a number of times yesterday -- they had another meeting -- that they are in about 90 percent agreement with the general objectives as stated in the Commission report and as far as amplifying it, with my statement of reservations, well, I said if that is the case, why don't you say that you do agree with the report?

Mr. Belluschi: He does the opposite. He condemns the report, almost in toto. One gets the impression --

Mr. Biddle: But they are gradually coming to the opinion of opinion that they agree to the report.

Mr. Belluschi: That is not the impression he gives to people he talks to. He talks to a great many people and people not too patient about hearing what is in this and that -- the whole report is terrible.

Mr. Biddle: At the proper moment a factual letter from us to him of a public sort would clear a lot of difficulties with the public.

Chairman Finley: I have corresponded with Goodrich as much as I am going to on the subject of Government and Art. It is not worthwhile to carry on the kind of correspondence that we have been having. You cannot convince him concerning anything about which there is disagreement.

Mr. Biddle: A tactful letter from us -- it is a question of what the art world feels.

Chairman Finley: He has misrepresented the report to the art world at least in New York, in many respects.

Mr. Belluschi: That is what he is doing all along.

Chairman Finley: Miss Louchheim and many other people have not been given the right impression. What can we do to counteract that point of view?

Mr. Biddle: I am gradually pointing that to their attention and they are practically agreeing that --

Mr. Belluschi: David, when you say I wouldn't write to Goodrich, I think you are right. That is a waste of energy and patience. But I think that when the time comes we should bring the positive sides of the report to public notice. In other words, our effort would have to be continuing one so as to prove that we are not the reactionaries we are accused of being, that we have reasons for disapproving certain things and approving others;

Chairman Finley: I agree with that.

Mr. Hudnut: I think it is a great mistake to explain anything. An explanation is an apology. Only have some positive things if you want to have done and bring that out to attract the attention of the art world. But I would not make explanations; that is playing right into their hands. "We want \$20 million; they want a postage stamp." Why give them that opening?

Mr. Biddle: That all depends on the moment and the way in which it is said. I think the art world would be very interested.

Mr. Hudnut: they will think of the right way.







Mr. Biddle: What do you mean by "they?"

Mr. Hudnut: Our enemies in art and government. Let us recognize them as our enemies.

Mr. Biddle: The art world has a certain press that represents it, The New York Times, the Art Digest, the Art News.

Mr. Hudnut: Yes.

Mr. Biddle: You can't sum them up as "they." To artists and museums all over the country interested in what the Federal Government is doing for art, it is not a hostile thing.

Mr. Hudnut: Whether hostile or not, I am just trying to make one point that we should not explain or apologize. We have made our report and it stands as it is. It does not need any talk whatsoever.

Mr. Biddle: I agree it should be positive statements of what we are doing.

Mr. Hudnut: If we have a positive statement to bring that out, we should do that; but we should not sit down and write letters and explain about our report. Anybody can open it and read it: There it is. And how undignified it is for us to get into a controversy with that group of go-getters who are just out to discredit us.

Chairman Finley: Goodrich is disappointed because he did not conduct the survey. He feels the Fine Arts Commission took it away from him.

Mr. Belluschi: Let's leave him out of it.

Chairman Finley: He formulates and writes the reports and calls the meetings. When he makes a report from the Committee on Government and Art, if he is kind enough to send us a copy of the report, then we may have reason to write to ~~xx~~ them or make some reply.

Mr. Hudnut: I wouldn't/

Chairman Finley: But he doesn't expect to send a copy of that report to this Commission and, as I said, he has not even sent a copy of the report of the Advisory Panel although I asked him in my letter to do so, as we appointed the Advisory Panel, and it should, of course, report to the Commission.

Mr. Hudnut: If you look on the Harvard shield you will notice written on the word "veritas": never explain.

Mr. Peets: Mr. Chairman, there are a good many points about the stamp competition which have not been quite resolved and Mr. Hudnut particularly should get the gossip about the last meeting at which he was



not present. Could we be sure that we have some time during this day to discuss that? For example, to dedicate the entire lunch period to it or something of that sort?

Chairman Finley: Or maybe this morning we could discuss it. We have invited the three advisory architects to meet with us at lunch. They have never lunched with us and Mr. Foster says the pressure of his own private practice is such that he must resign in January so I thought it was a good moment to ask all three of them to lunch with us. We can still discuss the stamp competition. They would be interested in that. We can still talk about it at lunch.

Mr. Peets: I will say for myself that I have several points that I would like very much to talk about and have a discussion on.

Chairman Finley: Why don't we get through the agenda and see if we have time left before lunch to discuss it here, and if not, we will discuss it at lunch. I will say I am with you regarding any legitimate publicity that we can get to set forth our ideas correctly. That would certainly be very desirable.

Mr. Biddle: If I should meet Mrs. Louchheim I think I could explain to her.

Mr. Belluschi: I think that would do much more good. I don't agree-- I hate to disagree-- about "never explain." It is all right in principle but in a case of a report there are only a few interested people who will read it or they read it only when it affects them directly; I believe that some constructive items in our report could be taken and made into articles which would explain what we would be willing to see the government do, which is what the report of the Commission of Fine Arts recommends. You can make many an article on that system.

Mr. Hudnut: That is what I mean by a positive program. That is what I am for. Let us take that up.

Mr. Belluschi: Make it positive.

Chairman Finley: I wonder if maybe George Biddle or someone couldn't write such an article for one of the art magazines.

Mr. Hudnut: I will write it.

Chairman Finley: Why don't you write an article? I think that would be the best thing.

Mr. Hudnut: Art News

Mr. Belluschi: Wonderful.

Chairman Finley: Ask them to get behind this project.

not present. Could we be sure that we have some good things to say  
to discuss that. For example, to discuss the entire world  
it or something of that sort?

Chairman Timney: Or maybe this morning we could discuss  
We have invited the three advisory committee to meet with us and  
they have never lunched with us and Mr. Foster says the president  
his own private practice is such that he must resign in January  
thought it was a good moment to have a group of them together and  
We can still discuss the same competition. They would be interested  
in that. We can still talk about it at length.

Mr. Foster: I will say for myself that I have a great deal to  
would like very much to talk about at a discussion.

Chairman Timney: Why don't we get it over the agenda and see if we  
have time left before lunch to discuss it and if not, we will discuss  
it at lunch. I will say I am with you regarding any discussion at lunch  
we can get to a point, our time is so tight. That would be a  
very desirable.

Mr. Bidder: If I should meet Mr. Rosenheim, I think I could  
explain to him.

Mr. Bidder: I think that would do much more good. I don't agree  
with that view about "never explain". It is all right in principle  
but in a case of a report there are only a few interested people who  
read it or they read it only when it affects them directly. I believe that  
some constructive items in our report could be better and made into  
articles which would clarify what we would be willing to see the  
Commission of the Commission of the Commission of the Commission of  
You can make every article on that subject.

Mr. Bidder: That is what I mean by a positive program. I think  
what I said before is that that up.

Mr. Bidder: Make it positive.

Chairman Timney: I wonder if maybe George Bidder or someone could  
write such an article for one of the next issues.

Mr. Bidder: I will write it.

Chairman Timney: May I say that you will be writing an article on the  
the best thing.

Mr. Bidder: All right.

Mr. Bidder: Wonderful.

Chairman Timney: Let them get behind the project.

Mr. Hudnut: I will do it. That is what we should do, is have a positive program, come out for it without referring to the committee or the report or anything of the kind. We are for this program and then it will be done without explaining.

Chairman Finley: You might bring in the musicians, also.

Mr. Hudnut: I will write a second article about the opera house.

Chairman Finley: That will take care of it.



For Historic... well as all... there is a... the...  
... it without... the...  
... the... and  
... without...

Chairman... for...  
... the...  
... the...